FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-063
Monday
2 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-063 CONTENTS *2 April 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Sea-Based Missile Building Viewed *[Bogachev in TASS]* 1
Bogachev Responds to Disarmament Questions *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Maj Gen Kuklev Comments on 'Open Skies' Talks *[TRUD 27 Mar]* 2
Genscher Support on Troop Cuts Cited *[TASS]* 4
'Breaches' Seen in Soviet ABM Warning System *[PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 4
INF Treaty Not Violated By SS-23's *[Moscow International]* 7
U.S. Satellites Monitor Missile Destruction *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Press Briefing Examines Lithuanian Secession *[TASS]* 9
Interpol President Pays Working Visit to Moscow 9
    Ryzhkov, Bakatin Meet With Barbot *[Moscow TV]* 9
    USSR Membership Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 9
European Economic Cooperation Conference Held *[TASS]* 9
Weekly 'Observers Roundtable' Aired *[Moscow Radio]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Receives U.S. Charge, Bush Message *[TASS]* 13
Moscow Cites Bush Message on Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 13
Yakovlev Receives U.S. Ambassador 30 Mar *[TASS]* 13
Bakatin Receives U.S. Prison Delegation *[TASS]* 13
Baker's Remarks on 'Spirit of Cooperation' Noted *[Moscow International]* 13
Shevardnadze-Baker 4-6 Apr Talks Previewed *[Moscow International]* 13
Reportage on Sen. Kennedy's Visit to USSR 14
    Discusses Lithuania at Supreme Soviet *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 14
    Meets Moscow Citizens *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 14
    Interviewed on Talks With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 14
'Inert' U.S. Approach to Afghanistan Noted *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 15
U.S. Continues Ideological 'Warfare' With Cuba *[TASS]* 16

China

Li Peng Interviewed on Sino-Soviet Relations *[Moscow International]* 16
Li Peng's Upcoming Visit to USSR Previewed *[Moscow International]* 18
Wang Renzhi-Led Delegation Continues Visit *[Moscow International]* 18
    Wang Renzhi Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 19
USSR, China Discuss Hard-Currency Trade *[TASS]* 19
Commentaries Discuss Nature of Sino-Soviet Ties 19
    Termed 'Non-Ideological' *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 19
    Importance of Interparty Ties *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 20

Northeast Asia

TASS Chief Meets Japanese Foreign Minister *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 21
Anniversary of Soviet-DPRK Ties Marked *[Moscow International]* 21

Bilateral, Other Trade With ROK Examined *[Moscow International]* 21
Australian Envoy Received at Foreign Ministry *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* 22
Official Addresses 'Asia Defense-90' Conference *[TASS]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Moscow Comments on Political Changes in Iran *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 22
Border Crossing Agreements Signed With Iran *[Baku Radio]* 23
Lukyanov To Visit India 4-8 April *[TASS]* 24
Dzasokhov Meets With Afghan Parliamentarians *[IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]* 24
Vorontsov Receives Lebanese Ambassador *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Comments on Recent Africa Trip 24
    'Profound Changes' Occurring *[TASS]* 24
    New Relations Needed *[Moscow International]* 24
De Klerk Discusses Perestroyka in South Africa *[Moscow TV]* 25
Ethiopia Decides To Postpone Socialist Aim *[PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 26

East Europe

Modrow Gives Interview on German Unification *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 27
Retaliatory Ban on Sale of Czechoslovak Currency *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 28
Issues in Withdrawal From Czechoslovakia Aired *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Embassy Holds News Conference on Lithuania *[Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA 28 Mar]* 29
Commentary Notes Lithuania as 'Stumbling Block' *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 29

West Europe

Shevardnadze Meets With France's Dumas 30 Mar 30
    Talks Begin *[TASS]* 30
    Cooperation Discussed *[TASS]* 30
    Lithuania, Germany Viewed *[AFP]* 30
Dumas Interviewed on Talks with Shevardnadze *[Moscow International]* 31
Further on Yazov's Visit to France 31
    Lithuania's Status Cited *[Paris Europe Number One]* 31
    Reims Base Visited *[TASS]* 31
    Departs 31 Mar *[TASS]* 32
Europeans Concerned About United Germany *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 32
United Germany Could Stay in NATO *[Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network]* 34
Reasons for London Rioting Remain Unknown *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 34

Latin America & Caribbean

Levchenko Notes Developments in Central America *[Levchenko on Moscow International]* 34
Panama's Expulsion of Cuban Ambassador Viewed *[Deruga on Moscow International]* 35
Nicaraguan Protocol Creates 'Favorable Conditions' *[TASS]* 35
Continuing Contra Activities Cause Concern *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 35
Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in Venezuala *[TASS]* 36
CPSU Delegation Departs for Uruguay *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow Reports 2 Apr Supreme Soviet Agenda *[Moscow Radio]* 37
2d Vote Called for Soviet of Union Chairmanship *[TASS]* 37
Lukyanov on Parliament-President Relations *[TASS]* 37
Soviet of Union Approves National Equality Law *[Moscow International]* 38
Gorbachev Urges Aid for Mothers, Families *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 38

Law on MVD Internal Troops Published *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 39
Supreme Soviet Decision on Internal Troops *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Supreme Soviet Establishes Nationalities Committe *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Public Associations Bill Discussed *[TASS]* 40

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appeals to Lithuanians 31 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Federation Council Meets, Discusses Lithuania *[TASS]* 42
Gorbachev Addresses Session *[Moscow TV]* 42
Ligachev Comments on Party, Agriculture *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Yazov on Lithuania, Abolishing Alliances *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 45
Moiseyev on Spring Draft, Service Evasion *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 45
Ryzhkov Holds Discussion With Oil, Gas Leaders *[Moscow TV]* 46
Moscow, Kiev To Stage Pro-Lithuania Rallies *[Vilnius Radio]* 46
Liberal Democratic Party Congress Opens 31 Mar *[TASS]* 46
Party Chairman Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 47
'Marxist Platform' Criticizes CPSU Leadership *[TASS]* 48
PRAVDA Readers Dispute Democratic Platform *[31 Mar]* 48
Zolotov Appointed to Culture Post *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Zorin Comments on USSR Superpower Status *[Moscow International]* 50
Yeltsin Undermining of Gorbachev Noted *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 16 Mar]* 50
Opposition to Reforms Assessed *[NEW TIMES No 10]* 51
Trade Union Congress Elects Officials, Concludes *[TASS]* 55
Article Debunking Marx Legacy Rebutted *[PRAVDA 29 Mar]* 56
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Reader on Sobchak *[8 Mar]* 58
Official Interviewed on Cable Television Program *[Moscow TV]* 60
Komsomol Central Committee Plenum Opens 22 Mar *[TASS]* 60

Economic

Tyumen Oil Workers Continue 'Labor Dispute' *[Moscow Radio]* 60
USSR Economy Could Cause Government To Fall *[AFP]* 61
'Emergency' Export Controls Imposed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 61
List of Exports Requiring Licenses Expanded *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 62
Aviation Industry Minister Views ANT Affair *[IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]* 63

Military

Statement Notes Baltic Opposition to Call-Up *[TASS]* 66
Council of Ministers Directs Troop Draft *[Moscow Radio]* 67
USSR Decides on New Military Conscription Law 67
Amendments Published *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 67
Local Service Urged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar]* 68
Krivosheyev Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 68
Military Complains of 'Slanderous' Article *[Moscow Radio]* 69

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Belorussia Demands Return of Lithuanian Territory *[TASS]* 70
Lithuania Notes Demand *[Vilnius International]* 70
Lithuanian Spokesman Cited on Possible Referendum *[Stockholm Radio]* 71
Lithuania Asks Iceland To Host Talks *[AFP]* 71
Landsbergis Interviewed on Response to Gorbachev *[Jerusalem Radio]* 71
Lithuanian Parliament To Examine Gorbachev Appeal *[TASS]* 72
Landsbergis Claims Appeal Contains 'Open Threats' *[Vilnius International]* 72
Reportage on Dismissal of Lithuanian Procurator 72
Offices Occupied *[AFP]* 72
Paulauskas Dismissed *[Moscow TV]* 72

Further on Procurator Controversy *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Lithuanian Law on Procuracy Changed *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 21 Feb]* 74
Lithuania Voids USSR Law on Procurator *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 21 Feb]* 74
Procurator's Office, History Institute Occupied *[Vilnius International]* 74
Report on Troops in Press Building *[Vilnius Radio]* 75
Landsbergis Refuses To Renounce Achievements *[IVilnius Radio]* 75
Arrival of 'Military Equipment' Seen in Vilnius *[Vilnius Radio]* 76
Troop Movements Reported on Lithuanian Seacoast *[Vilnius Radio]* 76
Reporter Finds No 'Paratroopers' in Vilnius *[Moscow TV]* 76
'Excursion' by Troops to TV Tower Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
Bickauskas Appointed Representative, Wants Talks *[Vilnius International]* 77
Military Prosecutor on Lithuanian Deserters *[Moscow TV]* 77
Arrests of Lithuanian Deserters To Continue *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Mar]* 78
Lithuanian Ministry Views Building Occupation *[Vilnius International]* 78
Lithuanian Organs Refuse To Surrender Firearms *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 31 Mar]* 79
Lithuanian Troops Urged To Keep Service Oath *[Moscow Radio]* 79
Commissar Says Lithuanians Returning To Service *[TASS]* 80
Prunskiene Discusses Military Order *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Council Issues Statement on Military Service *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Defense Ministry Issues Statement on Deserters *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]* 81
Vilnius Radio Calls KGB Protest 'Interesting' 82
Brazauskas on Worsening Economic Ties *[Vilnius International]* 82
Lithuanian Situation 'Complex, Contradictory' *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 82
Landsbergis Holds News Conference *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
Bakatin Comments on Lithuanian Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 84
TASS on 'Normal Routine' in Lithuania 86
Vilnius Radio Broadcast Operations 'Normal' 87
U.S. Reaction to Lithuania Moves Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 87
Kiev Rally Supporting Lithuania Noted *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Polish Minority Views Lithuanian Independence *[Warsaw PAP]* 87
Readers, Foreign Media Cited on Lithuania *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 88
Rallies Express Opposing Views on Lithuania *[TASS]* 88
Political Analysts on Solutions to Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 88
Peace Committee Urges Union, Lithuanian Dialogue *[Moscow TV]* 91
Political Dialogue Advocated for Lithuania *[East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 28 Mar]* 92
Independent Party Chief on 'Complex' Situation *[Moscow TV]* 92
Landsbergis Television Appeal Noted *[Vilnius Radio]* 93
Lithuanian Economic Independence Doubtful *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 21 Mar]* 93
Landsbergis Absent From Federation Council *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 96
Baltic Fleet Protests to Landsbergis *[Moscow International]* 97
First Visa Issued to Foreign Journalist *[Vilnius International]* 97
Suspension of Vilnius English Broadcasts Explained *[Vilnius International]* 97
Interdepartmental Press Center Opens in Vilnius *[TASS]* 97
Lithuanian Interior Minister on Domestic Situation *[Budapest NEPSAVA 28 Mar]* 98
Estonian Supreme Soviet Reportedly Reorganized *[Helsinki Radio]* 98
Tallinn Radio Reports on Supreme Soviet Session 99
Estonian Leaders View Supreme Soviet Session *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 99
Estonian Supreme Soviet Moves for Independence *[TASS]* 100
Estonian Council of Ministers Chairman Resigns *[Moscow TV]* 101
Estonian Draftees Exempted by Labor Service *[Tallinn Radio]* 101
Estonia Votes Not To Accept Soviet Annexation *[AFP]* 101
Estonians Vote for Road to Independence *[AFP]* 101
Pro-Moscow Estonian CP Holds First Plenum *[SOVETSAKYA ROSSIYA 29 Mar]* 102
Estonia Transition to Independence Expected *[AFP]* 102
Report on Two Opposing Rallies Held in Riga *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 102
Paper Views Latvian Election Activities *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 21 Mar]* 103

RSFSR

'Democratic Russia' Bloc Formed *[TASS]* 104
Moscow City Soviet Deputies' Groups Identified *[TRUD 31 Mar]* 105

Moscow Solidarity Rally for Lithuania 31 Mar *[Vilnius Radio]* 105
Gorbachev Approves Revival for Arctic Groups *[Moscow International]* 106
Gorbachev Attends Northern Peoples Congress *[Moscow TV]* 106

Western Republics

Ukrainian Communist Party Holds Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 106
    Ivashko Addresses Plenum *[Kiev International]* 107
    Candidate Members Elected *[Kiev Radio]* 108
Ukrainian First Secretary Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 108
'Difficult' Georgia Trends, Politics Noted *[Moscow TV]* 109

Caucasus

Internal Affairs Deputy on Transcaucasus Situation *[TASS]* 109
Azerbaijani, Armenian Leaders Meet in Georgia *[Baku Radio]* 110
    Discuss Transport Links *[TASS]* 110
    More on Meeting *[Yerevan Radio]* 111
Armenian Party, Ministry Issues Appeal for Calm *[Moscow TV]* 111
Situation in Shamshadinskiy Rayon Reviewed *[Yerevan Radio]* 112
Armenian Attacks on Nakhichevan Resume *[Baku Radio]* 112
Armenian Attacks on Nakhichevan ASSR Halted *[Baku Radio]* 113
Armed Armenian Attack Kazakhskiy Rayon *[Baku Radio]* 113
Armed Armenians Prepare To Attack Tauzskiy Rayon *[Baku Radio]* 113
Soviet Troops Arrest Armenian Recruits *[AFP]* 113
Shooting Reported 'Along Entire Length' of Border *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Mar]* . 114
Azerbaijan Representative on Border Situation *[TASS]* 114
Azerbaijan First Secretary Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 114
Azerbaijan Central Committee Plenum Convenes *[Moscow Radio]* 115
    Reshuffles Central Committee *[Baku Radio]* 116
Kapliyev Named New Military Commandant in Baku *[TASS]* 116
    Kapliyev on Protective Measures *[Baku Radio]* 117
Strike in Nagorno-Karabakh Declared Over *[TASS]* 117

Central Asia

Kazakh Supreme Soviet To Convene 24 April *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 117
Kazakh SSR Appoints New KGB Chairman *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 117
Kazakh Communist Party Plenum Held 19 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 117
Uzbekistan Parliament Elects New Leaders *[TASS]* 118

U.S. Sea-Based Missile Building Viewed

LD3003171290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1242 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Vladimir Bogachev commentary]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

In the United States it has been officially announced that testing of the Trident-2 sea-based MIRV nuclear missile has been completed. On Tuesday the nuclear-powered submarine Tennessee, which is equipped with 24 of these missiles, set off for the Atlantic, where it will carry out patrol duties.

According to AP, each Trident-2 missile carries 12 nuclear warheads rather than eight, as was originally planned. This means that the Tennessee is capable of striking 288 targets from as far away as 7,400 km.

During his time as U.S. president, Jimmy Carter admitted that in order to implement the concept of nuclear "deterrence", the United States needed to have no more than two or three missile submarines. But at present the Pentagon is planning to deploy 24 new submarines by the 2001 financial year and to procure 871 Trident-2 missiles for them. So this program, on which $35 billion has already been spent, has nothing remotely to do with "deterrence" or defensive objectives. Its purpose is a fantastic build-up in the United States's offensive nuclear might.

It is noteworthy that the authors of the Trident program are completely ignoring the already agreed parameters of a future Soviet-U.S. agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments. Even if each of the 871 Trident-2 missiles is to carry not 12 but only eight nuclear wearheads, the total will still be almost 7,000 units, which is significantly higher than the already agreed combined limit of 4,900 for warheads carried on sea-based and land-based strategic missiles.

One has to acknowledge an unfortunate fact. The U.S. side is not only refusing to limit sea-based cruise missiles on a bilateral basis, but is also continuing to build up those types of sea-based armaments which it agreed to reduce at the talks in Geneva.

Such an approach by Washington to the problems of sea-based weapons could hold up the Geneva talks on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments as a whole, or even deprive them of all meaning.

Bogachev Responds to Disarmament Questions

LD3003170790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] [Presenter Patsyuk] Hello, esteemed comrades. We are beginning our broadcast, which, as always, is based on listeners' letters.

Comrade Makarov, a listener from the village of Krivozerye in Penza Oblast, expresses the view that U.S. President George Bush and his NATO allies do not wish to disarm. Who is it that the states of the NATO bloc intend to defend themselves against? our listener asks. We asked Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military observer, to reply to this question.

[Bogachev] It is interesting that quite recently Richard Cheney, the U.S. defense secretary, was asked a similar question by (Lesley Stowe), an observer of the American corporation CBS.

[Patsyuk] What kind of question was this?

[Bogachev] Do you really believe that the Soviet Union intends to attack us? she asked the Pentagon chief.

[Patsyuk] And what was Cheney's reply?

[Bogachev] No, Cheney admitted laconically, it does not intend to attack us.

The question arose in connection with the fact that, despite the positive changes in the climate of international relations in the past five years, in its new budget the Pentagon requested in Congress additional appropriations for new weapons systems—among them the MX intercontinental ballistic missile (?and) Midgetman, weapons for Star Wars, the fantastically expensive invisible Stealth bomber, new submarine-launched nuclear missiles, and air-launched cruise missiles. That is to say, the Pentagon continues to prepare for war—and not only for a defensive war.

[Patsyuk] Well, is the listener from Penza Oblast, comrade Makarov, right?

[Bogachev] Unfortunately, many U.S. leaders, when pursuing their military policies, are so far refusing to take into account the realities of the present-day world and are adhering to old political thinking. One gets the impression that the increase of the U.S. military budget is no longer connected with the task of ensuring the country's security but has become a maniacal end in itself for the Pentagon and for the American military-industrial complex.

[Patsyuk] Vladimir Ivanovich, as far as I can remember President George Bush has repeatedly said in his public statments that he wishes success for the process of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and that in no circumstances does he intend to make use of the economic difficulties in the Soviet Union in order to achieve unilateral advantage for the United States. What can you say in this connection?

[Bogachev] The process of perestroyka in our country has produced a true revolution in international relations. What is most important, the probability of a catastrophic nuclear war has been sharply reduced. Now the main role is being played by non-ideological differences between the states and even by the lack of correlation in military might. Considerations of stability, of the predictability of the other side's actions are moving to the forefront of Soviet-U.S. relations. I think that Bush sincerely wishes success for the process of political perestroyka in our country. A sharp change in the political situation in the Soviet Union could also exacerbate Soviet-U.S. relations, and this would be fraught with dangerous consequences.

[Patsyuk] Does Washington really not intend to make use of our difficulties for obtaining unilateral military advantage?

[Bogachev] I am not very confident, Konstantin Nikolayevich, that that is the case. Many American politicians are openly saying that the present situation is opening up before the United States a whole panorama of opportunities. This same Cheney insists that the United States maintain superiority in military equipment. To all appearances, other American politicians state, the Soviet Union is prepared to pay any price for peace and stability in Europe in order to be able to concentrate on its internal problems. The United States should look for methods to force the USSR to swtich its resources to tasks that would be least rational for Moscow, they say. Many U.S. military leaders are seeking to impede the development of the Soviet Union by whipping up the arms race in such areas—for instance, expensive space strike systems. I am certain that the Pentagon's calculations that events in the world will develop according to its scenario are groundless.

[Patsyuk] And how are Soviet-U.S. and multilateral negotiations on arms control proceeding now?

[Bogachev] Some progress has been made on a number of issues—in particular chemical weapons, conventional armaments, and armed forces. Important negotiations on open skies have started. However, it seems to me that in the present situation of a lowering of international tension, it should be possible to achieve greater progress at the negotiations. The Americans, for instance, continue to refuse to even discuss the question of reducing naval armaments because they have a considerable lead in this field. One thing that causes us special concern is the U.S. approach to problems of tactical nuclear weapons testing. At the negotiations on strategic offensive armaments, the U.S. delegation recently raised the question of banning the modernization of some nuclear systems—in the first place of Soviet systems. Meanwhile, if one observes the principles of equality and equal security, the banning of modernization should apply to all components of strategic offensive armaments and delivery vehicles which are in service both in the USSR and the United States.

[Patsyuk] How do you assess the prospects for the development of international relations as a whole?

[Bogachev] Despite the difficulties which emerge from time to time, the new political thinking, whose chief generator is the Soviet Union, is confidently conquering positions in the internatioal arena and this gives us grounds to look to the future with optimism.

[Patsyuk] Thank you, Vladimir Ivanovich.

Maj Gen Kuklev Comments on 'Open Skies' Talks

90WC0059A Moscow TRUD in Russian
27 Mar 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Major General V. Kuklev, first deputy chief of the General Staff, by unidentified correspondent; date and place not specified: "The Spy Place 'Within the Law'"]

[Text] The first stage of the "Open Skies" conference attended by the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO member countries took place last month in Ottawa. Its aim is to reach agreement on creating a regime that would allow states to carry out flights by unarmed aircraft over each other's territory and observe military activity from the air.

Our correspondent met with the leader of the delegation of Soviet military experts at the conference, Major General V. Kuklev, first deputy chief of the General Staff.

[TRUD] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, the idea of an "open skies" regime was put forward by U.S. President Eisenhower way back in 1955....

[Kuklev] That is quite true. But at that time the cold war was at its height and the concept could not be implemented. It was rejected by the Soviet side virtually without discussion. But the years have passed and our approaches to many problems—including security and secrecy—have altered. Therefore, when President Bush proposed in May of last year that the subject be discussed again, the seed, as they say, fell on fertile ground.

[TRUD] A conference is not the same as negotiations. At the conference the parties merely stated their views and approaches to finding a solution to the problem. Notwithstanding, do the positions of the delegations coincide on the basic issues?

[Kuklev] At the conference all of those attending showed complete understanding of the importance of the "open skies" regime and a desire to try to achieve agreement on this issue. As far as its specific aspects are concerned, quite serious differences were revealed there.

First, this applies to the aircraft that will operate in the "open skies." The NATO position is this: Each country or group of countries should use its own aircraft for flights over the territory of other countries. We proposed that the side being observed should itself choose the aircraft used to make the overflight of its territory, either its own aircraft, an aircraft of the observing side, or of some third country.

Here we were guided primarily by economic considerations. Let me give you an example to clarify this. Early in January of this year, an aircraft of the Canadian Air Force made an experimental flight. It took off from Lahr Air Base in the FRG, and with the agreement of the appropriate authorities it flew over the territory of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. This flight cost the Canadians 82,100 of their dollars, and the cost for Hungary was $5,000. And when this was done there was no sensing equipment aboard the aircraft and the duration of the flight was minimal. If we consider that the Americans have their own bases around the USSR but we, as is known, do not have any of our bases near the United States, then it becomes clear that in the event that the NATO variant is adopted the sides will be placed in unequal economic positions. Moreover, technical servicing for "foreign" aircraft will become a serious problem that will be difficult to resolve (including from the economic aspects).

Second, we favor having aboard the aircraft equipment that has been agreed on with respect to types and specifications. Only if this is done will it be possible to obtain information that can be compared.

[TRUD] But of course, as far as I know no country raised objections to having only permitted equipment aboard the aircraft. Moreover, the representatives of the West are proposing that incoming aircraft be inspected for that purpose.

[Kuklev] Let us start with the latter. The experts claim that even in 20 hours (and this is the exact figure in the NATO draft) it is impossible to ascertain that no extra instruments have been placed aboard a modern aircraft. Moreover, this kind of inspection is by no means harmless from the standpoint of flight safety.

Now as to the equipment. The NATO countries are introducing the concept of "forbidden equipment" and making lists of it. In this way, all other instruments (and even those that may be designed in the future) are not included on this list. We also have differences with respect to types of equipment. We proceed from the premise that in order to observe military activity visual instruments—optical and optoelectronic—are inadequate. NATO is proposing in addition the use of infrared equipment and synthetic-aperture radar (the so-called side-looking radars), multispectrum equipment, and instruments to take air samples, magnetometers, gravitometers, and laser detectors.

The question involuntarily arises: What is the need for all of this? To build confidence? Hardly. For intelligence purposes? Then we are talking about something quite different.

Proposals as to the way in which the information obtained is used lead to the same thought. The Americans want each country to gather information itself, using its own aircraft, only for itself. Here, without reporting the results even to the side being monitored. Whereas we think that a unified data bank should be set up. For by no means all of the 23 states will be able to carry out frequent monitoring flights. Sometimes it will be more advantageous to buy the necessary information. So a data bank is not only fair but also advantageous.

When discussing the relationship of confidence-building measures and intelligence I would not like to appear overly suspicious. Moreover, we have consistently advocated less secrecy. But in this case how do we assess the following situation: The United States announces that there should be no "closed" zones on USSR territory and at the same time removes from our observation the bases located close to the Soviet Union?

[TRUD] And are there many such "closed" zones on our territory?

[Kuklev] There are such zones in virtually all countries. And here neither military nor civilian aircraft can fly—for example, over major cities or chemical or other ecologically dangerous enterprises, or nuclear power stations or water installations except in emergency situations. Why then should we make an exception to this rule for foreigners, thus subjecting the lives of our fellow citizens to extreme danger? Moreover, we still have regions that are closed in the interests of preserving state secrets. But first, they are very few, and second, we acknowledge their presence to the countries in the West. As they say, everything should be equal.

[TRUD] The Soviet delegation at the conference insisted that preliminary "notice" of an observation flight should be given twice as early as that proposed by the NATO representatives. Why was this?

[Kuklev] Yes, we wanted to increase the period of notification of a flight up to 48 hours. But not in order to "hide" sometimes—the route flown by the aircraft is by common agreement when the observer group arrives—but in order to deal with certain technical matters. For example, some states need time to lease an aircraft (if the flight is using equipment from a third party), and the time needed for the crew briefing, inspection and checks of equipment, and so forth.

[TRUD] Will there be restrictions on the number of flights in the "open skies" regime.

[Kuklev] Undoubtedly. We have not yet reached an agreed figure, but all 23 countries are agreed that restrictions are necessary. Here we again proceed from considerations relating to material costs.

[TRUD] You often make reference to economic motives. Earlier when talking with military chiefs I did not hear them counting the money. But if we do proceed from economic positions, then perhaps "open skies" are not even necessary. Because there are such things as space satellites....

[Kuklev] The country is short of money. Defense spending is being strictly controlled. Additional money cannot be "extracted" even for confidence-building measures. So that we literally have to count every ruble.

With respect to observation from space, let me offer you just two items for consideration. Again there is the economics of it: Given all the expense, observation from the air is much less expensive than space monitoring.

Moreover, the ingrained opinion on the limitless possibilities of satellites is greatly exaggerated. I am not about to go into detail, but in this instance aircraft are more effective. So "open skies" do make sense.

[TRUD] In our conversation you have frequently used the words "Soviet side" and "American side." The impression is created that the basic dispute was between two of the delegations....

[Kuklev] Well of course this was not the case. Before going to Ottawa, the representatives of the Warsaw Pact states naturally discussed the fundamental issues. In NATO they did the same. But there was not total agreement between all the colleagues of either side. For example, the Czechoslovak delegation suggested a compromise version envisaging the possibility of basing inspection aircraft at foreign air bases. But France actively supported our proposal that data acquisition should not go beyond confidence- building measures.

[TRUD] You have listed so many disagreements among those attending the conference that involuntarily the following question arises: Is agreement possible at all?

[Kuklev] I believe, I am even convinced, that it is possible. For we all have the main thing, namely, an understanding of the necessity and the feasibility of this concept. And disagreements are the inevitable "participant" of any negotiations. But we should not be afraid of this. I think that at the next stage of the conference there will be considerably fewer. We are working on this now.

Genscher Support on Troop Cuts Cited

LD2903161790 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Text] Vienna March 29 TASS—West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has welcomed the Soviet proposal to cut the number of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO troops in central Europe to 750,000 men for each alliance.

In a statement for the press, circulated here today within the framework of negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe, Genscher stressed that the Soviet proposal "corresponds to our own notions".

Genscher believes that disarmament should become "a major integral part" of the process of German unification.

The second phase of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces should, specifically, determine commitments related to the reduction of the Bundeswehr's strength, he said.

Tactical nuclear missiles should also be included in the disarmament process, and both sides should eliminate them, Genscher pointed out.

'Breaches' Seen in Soviet ABM Warning System

PM0104154090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by PRAVDA military desk editor Aleksey Gorokhov under the rubric "Top Secret": "The 'Stand at Pestryalovo': How Breaches Are Formed in the Country's Defenses"]

[Text] I share the concern that has increased recently with regard to the fulfillment of possible agreements on the reduction of ICBM's, the elimination of chemical weapons, and limitations on "conventional" arms. What does this mean? In my view, a very real situation is emerging in which we could encounter considerable difficulties with the implementation of these accords.

The "President's Eyes" and the Passion for Secrecy

It is not only a question of technologies. Ultimately the experience gained in Saryozek and at the Kapustin Yar range, where missiles were blown up, and the military chemists' experiments in Shikhany will help in the quest for the optimum ways of disposing of heavy machinery like ICBM's and safe methods of destroying chemical weapons. There is no problem here: The country's brains have not dried up yet.

The hitch lies elsewhere: Where will all this be done? On the moon?

Regional social movements, which have absorbed the stresses both from the general deterioration in the ecological situation and from the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, are categorically opposed to the construction of all kinds of bases, sites, and plants for the destruction of weapons on "their" territory. The accumulated energy is discharged, so to speak, and sometimes drastically so, in protest actions outside fences with red stars on the gates.

I do not think anyone would now risk shrugging aside public opinion, as they did in past times. At the end of February, for instance, Defense Minister D. Yazov "suspended" the construction of a major radar station near the village of Pestryalovo, near Mukachevo, the construction of which began in 1985 (some 100 million rubles, out of a total of 160 million, had already been used) and was due to be completed in 1993.

The Mukachevo station, as a typical Center for Tracking Space Devices, is one of nine similar ABM warning system [Sistema preduprezhdeniya o raketnom napadenii] facilities permitted under the ABM Treaty and located on the periphery of the country in so-called missile-risk salients.

For a long time the existence of this system within our military structures was kept secret, with remarkable persistence. Although as early as the late seventies and early eighties American reconnaissance satellites observed the construction of large radar stations first in the Pechora region, then at Olenegorsk near Murmansk, near Lake Balkhash, in Irkutsk Oblast, and near the Azerbaijani city of Mingechaur, and in 1983 near Krasnoyarsk.

This unconquerable passion for secrecy was, in my view, what largely gave rise to the difficult dialogue that the Defense Ministry is now having to conduct with the public. This is all the more regrettable because the ABM warning system is a defensive system, also known as "the president's eyes." Was there any point in concealing it from people?

In answer to this question of mine, Colonel General V. Kraskovskiy observed bitterly:

"It only led to all kinds of conjectures springing up around our construction sites...."

"In the Transcarpathian region, in particular, there was talk of a nuclear reactor, lasers, wasted forests, a lowering of the water level in wells, cardiovascular diseases, and so forth. The good intentions of people whose duty it is to defend the Fatherland and the demands of an anxious and totally uninformed population together formed a kind of critical mass, all it would take is a match."

"Why is the ABM warning system needed?" I asked the general.

"In the conditions of the established military-strategic parity," V. Kraskovskiy said, "the system makes a crucial contribution to the process of nuclear missile deterrence. Its purpose is to provide the country's military-political leadership with reliable information about a possible threat of attack and the missile and space situation."

[Gorokhov] Let us assume that the flying time for a missile with 10 warheads taking off—God forbid—from U.S. territory is 25-30 minutes, while for a delivery vehicle launched from the ocean theaters it is half that. You would hardly have time to smoke a last cigarette....

[Kraskovskiy] All the same, we should, we must give the leadership the time needed to assess the situation and take a decision.

[Gorokhov] What decision? To launch our own surviving missiles so as to inflict irreparable damage on the enemy? And finish off the planet?

[Kraskovskiy] I hope, I believe, that it will not come to that. But in theory, this is what it looks like. The information will make it possible to formulate countermeasures, prevent the escalation of the conflict, provide the Armed Forces with the necessary data, and warn the country's population. Furthermore such a system prevents the unleashing of a nuclear conflict "by accident," on the basis of false information.

[Gorokhov] That is, the ABM warning system is intended constantly to monitor [kontrolirovat] the status of means of attack?

[Kraskovskiy] Precisely. This is particularly important under the conditions of the defensive military doctrine we have adopted and the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The success of military detente depends on the existence on both sides of reliable means of monitoring, including ABM warning systems. This is probably the only way to implement the principle of defense sufficiency and substantially reduce military spending.

[Gorokhov] And if such means do not exist?

[Kraskovskiy] What then? Then we, the defending side, will stockpile nuclear weapons, disperse them all over the country's territory, make colossal efforts to increase their protection and survivability.... [Kraskovskiy ends]

Doomed Stations

I will not deny that several times during my conversation with Volter Makarovich Kraskovskiy a shiver went up my spine. And here is another question that has taken on very real outlines recently: What if nuclear missiles fall into the hands of political adventurists or arrogant regimes capable of carrying out so-called unauthorized launches?...

The first stage in the ABM warning system is the space stage: Satellites locate a missile launch by the missile flames. The backbone of the system, however, is its second, ground-based stage.

There are currently about 17,000 devices of various origins in near-earth orbits, including obsolete satellites and pieces of booster rockets which regularly "fall" to earth on trajectories similar to ballistic trajectories. For instance, on 7 March our country's monitoring systems, primarily ABM warning stations, located four "fragments" of an American spy satellite which was inserted into orbit on 28 February with the help of the shuttle "Atlantis" and broke down.

And does not the ordinary training of troops in any country involve combat firing and training and test launches of various classes of missiles? An unskilled assessment of such activity entails a lethal risk to the planet. Not for nothing did the apparently paradoxical idea arise of, if not combining, at least coordinating the work of space monitoring and warning systems on a planetary scale. The exchange of initial data could, it seems to me, be the first step in this direction.

There is no need to demonstrate that any breach in this defensive structure could undermine confidence in the effectiveness of the system as a whole and prompt the other side to take ill-considered action.

Let me talk first of all about the sad fate of the Krasnoyarsk radar station.

People may ask: Was everything taken into account and calculated several moves in advance, as in chess, when they embarked on such a major project? Evidently not. It would have been possible to assume almost as a certainty that the "touchdown site" of the Krasnoyarsk radar station, a considerable distance from the state border, would in itself look like a violation of the ABM Treaty. And that is what happened.

Of course, the planners had to resolve difficult problems over the construction base, communications, availability of manpower, and so forth. And erecting a radar station somewhere else, on Kamchatka or Chukotka, would have cost you and me not 200-300 million, but 2-3 billion. But they hit a "snag." And another one, which came as a complete surprise: No one realized that a station operating in the one-meter waveband would also, in the American view, be a "flagrant violation" of the ABM Treaty. Although it remains to be seen who has more violations. I have in mind first and foremost the powerful American radar stations in Greenland and Britain, that is, far beyond the bounds of national territory.

But this bookkeeping is not the point at issue today. We could not bring ourselves to admit that there are ABM warning systems in the Soviet Union; the military were reluctant to work with the population and did not attempt to draw attention to their own needs, but basically condemned themselves to conflicts with politicians out of the public's view. The politicians, for their part, seeking to march with the times and stay in touch with panhuman problems, adopted courageous decisions which came as a surprise, to put it mildly, to the military.

If one delegation from the U.S. Congress on the banks of the Yenisey was not enough, then five or even 10 more such delegations should have been invited and convinced that the Krasnoyarsk radar, while being a center for tracking space devices, also fulfills the tasks of warning of a missile attack, that it is a component of an ABM warning system. Perhaps the verdict on the station would not have been so harsh....

Meanwhile, on other, Transcarpathian shores, by the Latoritsa stream, structures resembling the Egyptian pyramids were beginning to "spring up," alarming the entire district. The "stand at Pestryalovo" began.

Incidentally, let me observe that the old radar station, which was sited in this region about 15 years ago, apparently did not shock anyone. But what times were we living in? Such speedy horses were harnessed to the chariot of confrontation (in the form of the latest means of nuclear missile attack) that the monitoring system grew old as you watched. Modernization was needed at Mukachevo too.

...On 26 January the oblast soviet of people's deputies discussed the situation concerning the construction of the new radar station in Mukachevskiy Rayon at an emergency session. Here are some extracts from speeches by the participants in the session.

M. Malevanik, chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee: "Our position is to take into account both the interests of the state and the interests of the Transcarpathian population.... We will not permit the commissioning in the oblast of a project that would be harmful to people or damaging to the environment...."

Ye. Deshko, physician: "Our beautiful Transcarpathian region faces the threat of ecological disaster because of narrow departmental interests.... A terrible disaster lies in store for us and our grandchildren with the commissioning of the radar station...."

V. Khiminets, professor: "If scientists had been involved in the project under discussion at the stage of the planning of the station, then questions of ecology, location, and construction of the radar station would have been resolved five years ago...."

V. Prikhodko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Youth League Oblast Committee: "The Pestryalovo project as such has become a symbol of stagnation, lack of glasnost, and disrespect for our own people. To continue its construction in present conditions would be madness, a crime...."

In short, the oblast soviet decided to stop the construction of the radar station near Pestryalovo village. A referendum carried out in the oblast produced this result (by 21 February): More than 735,000 inhabitants, out of a total of 1,252,000, came out against the construction of the radar station.

Who Needs Standby Crews

So yet another breach is emerging in the country's defensive structures. Yet another commission—prestigious, as always—has been set up to evaluate the "social and ecological situation in the Mukachevo region and the effect of the radar station under construction on the population and the environment...."

Construction work is at a standstill, but the questions remain. If, say, a system like the ABM warning system is not needed at all, then let us say frankly to the officers: No one is threatening us, so no one needs your standby crews, pack up your radar stations and go away, make a new life for yourselves while you are still young!

But no one is going to say that today. Or tomorrow.

So the upshot is people in the units doing as they are told, an entirely uninformed population holding rallies, and a question mark on the diagram showing the Soviet ABM Warning System.

In the end there is reason to criticize the Defense Ministry and the General Staff. But let us not forget that the flight of a West German prankster cost Army General D. Yazov's predecessor his ministerial post and an honored front-line airman the post of commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces.

It transpires that society, through its government, invests a small group of people with personal responsibility for the country's security. And that same society, through numerous organizations, both formal and informal, is twisting the arms of those same responsible individuals: Don't build here, don't go there, and in fact, you'd better not put on your uniform at all! Here a law on defense would be no bad thing, but we still do not have one.

It is beyond dispute that public opinion must be respected, studied, and analyzed. No doubt many of us, from personal experience in life, could cite plenty of examples of feeling aggrieved and unhappy solely because something mysterious is happening outside your window, something which, because it is mysterious, is therefore harmful and raises the social temperature. Nonetheless, let us trust key questions of the Fatherland's defense to the professionals.

INF Treaty Not Violated By SS-23's

LD0104120890 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] The U.S. media have been actively discussing Soviet OTR-23 missiles, better known in the West as SS-23's deployed in East European countries. Some have mentioned a violation of the 1987 INF Treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Radio Moscow's military observer Colonel (Vadim Solovyev) takes a closer look at this problem.

The OTR-23 missiles in the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria have nothing to do with the INF Treaty. The Soviet Foreign and Defense Ministries say that in the first place, the USSR dispatched those missiles to its East European allies several years before signing the INF Treaty with the United States, which means they were outside Soviet jurisdiction during the negotiations on the treaty. Besides, all the OTR-23's that were at the Soviet Union's disposal have been scrapped under the control of the American commission set up in compliance with the treaty. And the manufacture of such missiles has been stopped, which too has been checked by the U.S. Commission supervising the production process at the missile assembly plant in Votkinsk.

Secondly, the sole existing OTR-23's are the property of the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria respectively, and it's up to those countries to decide what to do with their missiles. The East German Government, for one, has decided to scrap them.

And thirdly, all of the OTR-23's are equipped with conventional, not nuclear warheads.

With the situation being as clear as that, one may wonder why the OTR missiles in the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria have been treated with such suspicion. The deputy representative of the Soviet-American commission supervising compliance with the INF Treaty, (Stanislav Shemyakin) maintains that the chief reason is that the status of the OTR-23's is deliberately, or for/a lack of knowledge, believed to be similar to that of the American Pershing 1A's now in service with the West German Bundeswehr and partially deployed in the United States. Here's more from (Stanislav Shemyakin):

[Begin (Shemyakin) recording in Russian with superimosed English translation] The OTR-23 missiles of Soviet make stationed on East German, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian territories have no nucelar warheads, whereas the Pershing 1A missiles belonging to West Germany are tipped with nuclear warheads which are the property of the United States and are subject to American control. In other words, only the United States is in a position to order the use of these missiles and their nuclear modifications.

The future of these is defined in one of the protocols attached to the INF Treaty and viewed as an integral part of that treaty. It's been argued upon that the warheads in question must, within 15 days before the expiration of a three-year term since the INF Treaty took effect, be put out of use by NATO allies and withdrawn to the United States and scrapped in accordance with the procedure stipulated in the protocol attached to the INF Treaty. The said three-year term expires on the 1st June next year which means the warheads must be destroyed no later than 15 days before that date, thus, the Pershing 1As are covered by the INF Treaty and a subject to negotiations, whereas the non-nuclear OTR-23s belonging to three East European countries have nothing to do with either the treaty or relevant negotiations.

That's what prompted the Soviet Union to refrain from bringing up the subject of OTR-23's both during the INF talks and later. At present the American side has the appropriate explanations at its disposal. [end recording]

U.S. Satellites Monitor Missile Destruction

PM3003125990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Sabirov report: "Controlled Explosions"]

[Text] Yoshkar-Ola—A serious of powerful explosions have been heard at secret military facilities in the trans-Volga region of the Mari ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

"We gave advance explanations at population centers in Orshanskiy, Medvedevskiy, and Sovetskiy Rayons," V. Prodan, chief of the republic's nuclear civil defense staff, said. "Representatives of the local authorities and law-enforcement and other organizations, along with the press, were invited along as observers in order to see for themselves that these measures were completely safe and environmentally clean. All the operations took place strictly according to schedule, without the slightest malfunction, so that there was not even any need for the 'windows' which were built into the plan should the weather deteriorate."

The explosion pealed out like thunder up to the sky. The military equipment, with the main armament removed, was destroyed. Only gaping holes remained among the wooded thickets where the missile launchers had been. The special work using explosives was not only under comprehensive control from earth. U.S. satellites recorded the event from space. They scrupulously recorded the size of the craters formed.

Press Briefing Examines Lithuanian Secession

LD3003143990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1328 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—The resolving of issues on apportioning parts of the territory of any country into an independent state should be preceded by an expression of will by the people living on that territory. Yuriy Reshetov, chief of the administration for international humanitarian cooperation and human rights of the USSR Foreign Ministry, made a statement on this at a briefing today. He was commenting on the situation which had arisen in connection with the well-known decisions of the Lithuanian parliament.

According to the norms of international law, Yuriy Reshetov stressed, the decision on the procedure for talks between the center and this union republic on the subject of its separation from the USSR may be taken only if the majority of the population of Lithuania actually comes out in favour of secession from the Soviet Union during the course of a referendum.

Answering a question about using servicemen for the protection of buildings which are the property of the CPSU on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Soviet diplomat said that in this situation it is a matter of policing functions "directed toward supporting the rights and interests of citizens, the protection of property and the support of elementary law and order in that part of the country." He noted that the use of servicemen for these aims cannot be described as "the application of military force", since a quite definite meaning is invested in this concept in the appropriate international legal documents.

Yuriy Reshetov also indicated that calls which are being heard in the republic for those citizens of the republic who are coming out against secession from the USSR to be deprived of legal protection are an example of "very flagrant discrimination with political motives."

Interpol President Pays Working Visit to Moscow

Ryzhkov, Bakatin Meet With Barbot

LD3003191190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] "Comrade Ryzhkov today received at the Kremlin Ivan Barbot, president of the International Criminal Police Organisation, Interpol. Comrade Ryzhkov noted that our contacts with Interpol—an authoritative international organization of which 150 countries are members—are the consequence of the reforms that have been taking place in the Soviet Union of recent years. The expansion of international links in various fields, and the democratization of our country's political and economic life, are associated not only with positive processes, but also with some negative concomitant manifestations, among them smuggling—including drug smuggling, terrorism, and organized crime. The developing mutual communication among states makes it necessary that their law enforcement bodies cooperate actively, not just on a bilateral, but also on a multilateral basis. [passage omitted]

The conversation took place in a friendly atmosphere, with the USSR internal affairs minister, comrade Bakatin, taking part.

USSR Membership Discussed

LD3003195490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] "Ivan Barbot, president of the International Criminal Police Organization," also known as Interpol, is at present in Moscow on a working visit. Today he met the USSR minister of internal affairs, Comrade Bakatin.

Barbot said the USSR is the only major country not to be a member of Interpol. The question of its membership is to be discussed soon. Earlier this month, Bakatin met Interpol Secretary General Raymond Kendall, and the question of mutual cooperation was raised then. Last time, the discussion was general; this time "specific proposals" were considered.

European Economic Cooperation Conference Held

LD2303110190 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 23 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov]

[Text] Bonn March 23 TASS—The first conference on economic cooperation in Europe, held within the CSCE frameworks, continues here.

The Soviet Union was the topic of the day on Thursday. Problems of industrial cooperation with the USSR and its legal and administrative aspects were discussed by some 500 representatives of government organisations and business circles from 33 European countries, the United States and Canada. They included Soviet and foreign managers, directors of joint enterprises, businessmen and specialists from the East and the West.

Soviet representatives told them about new developments and trends in Soviet foreign economic relations. Some 14,000 Soviet enterprises and organisations now have the right to do business on the world market, where they can sell those goods that are produced over and above the official state order. They have the right to conclude agreements with foreign partners on production cooperation and to launch joint ventures. Eighty per cent of them received this right in 1989. This testifies to the accelerated growth of Soviet foreign economic relations.

"Work is nearing completion in the USSR on a joint enterprise bill. Agreements have been concluded with several Western states on the protection and encouragement of capital investments," Georgiy Petrov, deputy chief of the Central Board for Economic Relations with Developed Capitalist Countries under the USSR Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations, told TASS. "Our joint enterprises operate on the basis of self-subsistence and a part of their production is exported. This allows them to ensure high standards of production and the competitiveness of their goods."

"What's slowing down an increase in the number of joint enterprises? Primarily the problem of their supply, the insufficient development of our wholesale market and infrastructure and the inconvertibility of the ruble," Petrov said. "But the development of business contacts does not always depend on our country. Soviet businessmen cannot get exit visas to the West if they have no invitation from a Western partner. As to providing Western businessmen in the USSR with means of telecommunication, we are often unable to meet their requirements because of Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] lists banning the export of their equipment to the Soviet Union. The Bonn conference is expected to help revise these lists."

Weekly 'Observers Roundtable' Aired

LD0104173490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Apr 90

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Nikolay Agayants, with Boris Andrianov and Gennadiy Vedenyapin, all-union radio foreign policy commentators]

[Excerpts] [Agayants] [introductory passage omitted] The topics for discussion have been supplied by life itself, by the development of events and international relations and the foreign media reactions to them that have appeared on our teletype machine.

Without further ado, let us start with these. The press, radio, and television of various countries have been devoting great attention to the Presidential Council session that took place in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of the USSR President, and to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at it. In particular, the passage which deals with our state's foreign policy is highlighted. This is a clear and constructive policy, based on the principles of the new way of thinking which have been approved by the Soviet people and which have elicited a favorable response from people of goodwill throughout the world.

[Andrianov] As Comrade Gorbachev stressed in his speech, it would be a grave error to think that that is an end to it, that things can just roll along nicely of their own accord. Now that the changes have acquired fresh dynamics and are on a different scale, a number of new, serious, and sometimes unexpected problems are arising, such as the issue of disarmament, the European process, our actions in the Asian-Pacific region and in other directions. Life has shown that there must be a reassessment of the issue relating to the Soviet Union's cooperation with the countries of East Europe. For example, totally new tasks are emerging in the sphere of foreign economic links, and alas, we do not have too much time to resolve them. It is essential that, without delay, we set about tackling many specific problems.

[Vedenyapin] Mikhail Sergeyevich gave the example of how we are to build our economic ties with the developing countries, or the export-import problem.

[Agayants] Yes, indeed, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, we simply cannot and we do not have the right to leave unaltered the strange situation—to put it mildly—by which our country has essentially turned into a supplier of raw materials and other natural resources, while at the same time is heavily dependent on supplies of food from abroad.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, all these questions need direct and clear answers. And when all is said and done, we must sort out how much longer we, the largest manufacturer of metal in the world, are to be condemned to continue importing large quantities of pipes and rolled steel. And another such problem is that of switching to world prices in our trade with all countries, and consequently of the long-overdue steps—by that I mean the switch to a convertible ruble. In his speech to the Presidential Council, Mikhail Sergeyevich stressed that all these problems are so important that, he believes, a reliable mechanism must be set up at Council level to make analyses, work out solutions and exercise control.

[Agayants] It should also be noted that the concepts set out by the head of our state for moving ahead along the road of perestroyka and along the road of further reducing the tension the persists on the planet, and the policy of cooperation have met with approval in the world. Testimony to this are the numerous reactions abroad from the mass media and the speeches of prominent politicians and public figures in various countries, but above all in Europe. [passage omitted on the results of the first round of the Hungarian elections; the closer the parties that formerly were united against the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party come to power, the more evident become their differences; 'Le Monde' quoted: There is still a second round of elections to come, and this may lead to a change in the balance of power]

[Vedenyapin] Here and there in East Europe even now there are phenomena visible to the naked eye which can only serve to provoke anxiety, and which, I believe, could cast doubt on the democratic intentions of the new ruling teams, if I may put it that way. For all the assurances of a commitment to the left, to liberalism and democracy, alas it is the conservative, right-wing forces that are appearing more and more on stage. This presents a danger that the old command systems could be replaced by a new totalitarianism—this time with a clear-cut antisocialist and anticommunist bent.

[Agayants] It is no secret that in various places it has been decided to remove the monuments to Vladimir Ilich Lenin and send them to be melted down. But not infrequently we are seeing not just reprisals against the idea of communism, but against specific individuals. Some countries in East Europe have, unfortunately, started persecuting communists—all sorts of purges, dismissals from work, arrests, and even trails. Taking just the examples of Czechoslovakia or Poland, communists there are being removed from all top posts in the economy, the civil service, culture, health, education, and journalism. The scale of this in Czechoslovakia is demonstrated by the story of the director of a school in the town of Olomouc who has gone on a hunger strike to protest against the slandering of communists, their persecution, and the discrimination against them. It is a sign of the times that updates on this story have consistently only been published in the party newspaper RUDE PRAVO. The other mass media have preferred to maintain silence on this story.

[Andrianov] In the GDR, where the conservatives won at the recent parliamentary elections, this anticommunism is sometimes starting to grow into neo-Nazism, into thuggery along the lines of the 1930s. In Leipzig the neo-Nazis have organized the full-blown persecution of foreigners. All that is lacking, perhaps, is the sadly famous brown uniform.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, it is currently fashionable to speak of a pluralistic society, new democratic socialism, parliamentary democracy, a market economy. Let us hope, of course, that all this will come about, and that what communists are undergoing in various East European countries is merely a fleeting side-effect. It is possible. The future will show what the final result is—social democracy, primitive capitalism, or new totalitarianism. All we can do is hope for the best. [passage omitted: world attention this past week on Near East and Israel's settling of the occupied territories; Soviet Union believes there should be a rapid resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict]

[Vedenyapin] An unprecedented propaganda campaign has been fanned over the increased emigration of Soviet Jews. It was started by Yitzhaq Shamir, head of the Israeli Government, when he said that he was examining the prospect of up to half a million Soviet Jews settling in Israel in the next five years. This would supposedly help bring to fruition the dream of a Greater Israel.

[Agayants] In fact, Tel Aviv has not restricted itself to half a million, but has mentioned the figure of 750,000 such emigrants from our country.

[Andrianov] They love juggling with big numbers there, trying to convince people that a mass emigration is in the offing. As you have said, what Shamir is driving at is that there will be a substantial increase in the number of Soviet Jews going to Israel. As for his mention of the so-called Greater Israel, that has been seen as a desire to send these immigrants to the West Bank of the River Jordan and the Gaza Strip. And furthermore, to house them in the settlements which have been set up on the occupied Arab territories in breach of the norms of international law.

[Vedenyapin] Of course, our country could not allow this to go unremarked. Just recall the statement delivered by Comrade Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, to the head of the Israeli consular group. He stressed that we cannot but be concerned over the fact that some of the Jewish emigrants from the USSR have yielded to the unscrupulous propaganda and become a tool with which to implement the illegal plans deplored by international public opinion.

[Agayants] You know what occurs to me? According to the Israeli press, the Tel Aviv authorities can realistically accommodate and find work for somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000 immigrants each year. Taken over five years, this amounts to just a third or a quarter of the half million people that Shamir mentioned. Thus, his call for mass emigration smacks strongly of bluff. It looks very much as though Shamir has deliberately opted for political provocation. And you know why I think this is? In order to drive a wedge through the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the Arab world above all.

[Andrianov] The indications are that Shamir has not succeeded in driving his wedge. But frankly, Tel Aviv's calculations have given rise to anxiety in the Arab world. There is no point in concealing the fact that it is the Arabs who are most worried about Israel's avowed intentions. The Palestinians above all, of course. Yasir 'Arafat has described them as a disaster for the Arab world that could slow down the process of peaceful settlement in the Near East.

[Vedenyapin] Incidentally, in the heat of the controversy there have been open attacks on our country. In the Egyptian press, for example, the permission for Jews to leave the Soviet Union has been seen nearly as the crime of the century. This sort of stinging rebuke has come from other quarters, and there have even been open calls for Moscow to forbid Soviet Jewish citizens to leave for Israel, otherwise this would be seen as a betrayal of the interests of the Palestinian people. Just that.

[Agayants] In my opinion, all this should be put down to emotions. After all, the appeal for Moscow to halt emigration is simply unrealistic and consequently unworkable. How could the Soviet Union take such a step after signing the Vienna Accord? That would mean violating its international undertakings and striking at the democratic process within our country. It is not hard to guess how the Soviet Union would appear to the Arab world after that! And so, we must be guided not be emotions, but by a healthy assessment of the true state of affairs; by a sober view of the Soviet Union's policy in the Near East. Otherwise we could make any number of terible mistakes.

[Andrianov] This is not meant as a reproach to the Near East leaders who have hastened to accuse the Soviet

Union so unjustifiably, but for the sake of fairness it should probably be recalled that in the years between the 1940s and 1960s there was a mass exodus to Israel from the Arab states. And now emigrants from those countries account for 40 percent or more of Israel's Jewish population. That's another statistic to bandy about!

[Vedenyapin] There is one material point that I think it would be apposite to mention, Boris Vasilyevich. The number of people emigrating to Israel from the Soviet Union has grown not just because our country has given anyone who wishes the freedom to leave. One patently obvious fact that must not be overlooked is that the immigration policy of the United States has undergone a change. More than half of all Jews who left the Soviet Union used to head for there.

[Agayants] The British newspaper INDEPENDENT ON SUNDAY has remarked upon the contradictory and inconsistent position of the United States on the subject of Jewish immigration. U.S. policy on this, says the newspaper, is like an unsolved crossword.

[Andrianov] I would not say that it is like a crossword or a rebus. But I do believe that it can be solved. Let us just recall how, for years on end, Washington literally demanded that Moscow open the doors to the free exit of the Jews. Moreover, the United States accused the Soviet Union of human rights abuses. But now that our country has flung open these doors, the selfsame United States has erected a barrier to Soviet Jewish emigrants. Washington has introduced a strict quota of 50,000 people a year. One might wonder whether, given that the Americans were so keen on the freedom for Soviet Jews to leave, it would not have been more logical for them, instead of restricting this freedom of theirs, to give them the opportunity to head straight for America.

[Agayants] There is another legitimate question that arises: Should it be regarded as mere coincidence that the restrictions on the entry of Soviet Jews was introduced just when they had obtained the right to leave our country freely? Does it not strike you that the United States closed the door on these emigrants on purpose to force them to go to Israel?

[Vedenyapin] I would suggest that there can only be one answer to that question: Of course the U.S. decision was aimed at this. The double standards of Washington's approach to its avowed commitment to the universal observance of human rights are quite clear. On the one hand spokesmen for the U.S. Administration claim that the United States has not and will not help in the settlement of Soviet Jews on the occupied territories, and condemn the statement by Shamir which have mentioned. Yet on the other hand, each year Washington supplies military and economic aid to Israel worth $3 billion. It must be clear to everybody that, without such financial injections, Tel Aviv would not be able to accept a large number of emigrants.

[Andrianov] There is no dispute: Israel has the right to take immigrants from any country. Nobody would deny them that. But that in no way gives it the right to settle them on the lands of others. And if the Jews from the Soviet Union appear in the role of colonialists or occupationists, then these interlopers will inevitably encounter resistance from the Palestinian people who enjoy the unamimous support of the world public. Not for nothing is there a saying cautioning against building one's well-being on another's misfortune. [passage omitted on Nicaragua and the forthcoming transfer of power there; on the Sandinista's achievements there; and on the disarmament of the contras]

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Receives U.S. Charge, Bush Message

LD3003115990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1058 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, today received John Joyce, U.S. charge d'affaires ad interim in the Soviet Union, at the latter's request.

John Joyce conveyed a message to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev from U.S. President George Bush.

Moscow Cites Bush Message on Lithuania

LD3103011190 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] President Bush has called on Soviet President Gorbachev to settle the crisis in Lithuania by peaceful means. Marlin Fitzwater, speaking for the White House, told journalists in Washington that President Bush's position was outlined in a letter presented on Friday to Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Fitzwater noted that President Bush expressed support for the Lithuanians' desire to gain self-determination. The way out of the situation is through a peaceful dialogue, says the message.

President Bush has received Senator Edward Kennedy, who informed the President of the results of his trip to Moscow. Much attention during President Gorbachev's discussion with Senator Kennedy was paid to the situation in Lithuania.

Yakovlev Receives U.S. Ambassador 30 Mar

LD3003170290 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, today received the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, Jack Matlock, at his request.

They discussed issues of mutual interest.

Bakatin Receives U.S. Prison Delegation

LD2803190290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1742 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 28 Mar (TASS)—At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs today, Vadim Bakatin, member of the USSR Presidential Council and USSR internal affairs minister, met with a delegation of the U.S. Justice Department's Bureau of Prisons led by M. Quinlan, director of the bureau.

In a frank and detailed conversation, there was discussion of topical questions of the activity of law enforcement bodies of the USSR and the United States in combating crime, in particular questions connected with corrective labor institutions.

Baker's Remarks on 'Spirit of Cooperation' Noted

LD3103134290 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Speaking in Dallas, Texas, the U.S. secretary of state, Mr. James Baker, said that in his view democracy in the Soviet Union is the best guarantee for Moscow's constructive approach to international problems. Dwelling, among other things, on the situation in hotspots on the globe, Mr. Baker called for an end to regional conflicts and attainment of national reconciliation. In this connection he praised the Soviet stand which had contributed to a normal election process in Nicaragua. Such a stand, he said, testified to the Soviet Union's desire to create a spirit of cooperation in resolving regional problems.

Shevardnadze-Baker 4-6 Apr Talks Previewed

LD0104134290 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Two days of talks scheduled for 4th April through 6th in Washington between the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and American Secretary of State James Baker will undoubtedly be a major political event next week.

Negotiations between Shevardnadze and Baker is an important stage of preparation for a Soviet-American summit in June. However, it would be wrong to attach purely applied significance to these talks. World events change so fast, and nearly every day unexpected problems arise and call for consultations and the exchange of views.

In the United States, conservative elements have become active in the last few days in the wake of developments in Lithuania. The American Senate has passed a resolution that can be interpreted as no other than interference in Soviet internal affairs. Calls have been made to exert pressure on the USSR, impose economic sanctions on it and even cancel a Soviet-American summit. Such behavior is least of all prompted by concern about Lithuanians; it stems from the intention to return American-Soviet ties to the past period of the cold war and confrontation.

It is inconsistent to expect an anti-Soviet campaign to affect Moscow's strategic line. This country stands for the continuity of a Soviet-American political dialogue on equal terms. There must be no temptation to take advantage of the complex and turbulent process in the world in detriment to anyone. President Mikhail Gorbachev made this clear to American Senator Edward

Kennedy when he was in Moscow last week. And here is the view expressed by Mr. Kennedy:

[Begin Kennedy recording] A generation of U.S.-Soviet confrontation and cold war [word indistinct] is ending. An irresistible tide of liberty and self-determination is sweeping across the globe. I had the privilege of meeting with President Gorbachev on Monday, and we had an open and frank discussion about a wide range of challenges faced by the United States and the Soviet Union; and from my various meetings with him I am convinced he is committed to the process of perestroyka and continued progress in relations between our two countries. [end recording]

Edward Kennedy also said that the process of limiting conventional and nuclear arms should be continued because it's the buildup of arms, and particular nuclear weapons, that has brought us to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe. A strategic offensive arms reduction treaty should be signed as soon as possible to pave the way for deeper cuts in the future. It is necessary to reach agreement to ban nuclear testing once and for all and to get rid of the fear of a nuclear war in space and on earth forever. Together, Edward Kennedy said in conclusion, we should advance in all fields.

Reportage on Sen. Kennedy's Visit to USSR

Discusses Lithuania at Supreme Soviet

PM3003103190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] The theme of the 28 March meeting between E. Kennedy, chairman of the U.S. Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, was the need to nurture the trend toward the positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The situation in Lithuania was one of the main topics of conversation. The senator stressed that he personally finds what the USSR president and the USSR foreign minister have said on this subject reassuring, since it attests to the Soviet leadership's adherence to peaceful methods of resolving contentious problems. E. Kennedy pointed out that over the last five years M.S. Gorbachev has always succeeded in finding compromise solutions to the most complex issues. In the guest's opinion, the other means of settling the problem—that is, the use of force—could adversely affect the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the International Affairs Committee, said that the committee members will try at a coming committee session to give their reaction to U.S. Senate statements on events in Lithuania in a spirit of mutual correctness.

Meets Moscow Citizens

PM3003103390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[G. Charodeyev report: "Memento for the Senator"]

[Text] Representatives of the Moscow public met E. Kennedy, chairman of the U.S. Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, at the premises of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. Answering numerous questions, the senator advocated further progress in the sphere of conventional and nuclear arms control and stressed the need to complete the talks on a radical cut in the level of troops in time for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. He urged the USSR and the United States to redouble their efforts to secure an agreement on the complete banning of nuclear tests. "We must escape forever from the threat of 'star wars' in space and nuclear wars on earth," E. Kennedy stressed.

Speaking about the USSR's economic position, the senator noted that "the United States could help the Soviet Union in this difficult transitional period." In particular, E. Kennedy spoke of Americans' willingness to do all they can to help Soviet children injured as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

The American guest was handed a memento in the form of a coin fashioned from metal left over from the destruction of a Soviet SS-4 missile.

Interviewed on Talks With Gorbachev

PM0204103390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Senator Edward Kennedy by G. Vasilyev; place and date not specified: "'We Are Seeing a New Day Dawn'"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Kennedy] This is my fourth trip to the Soviet Union—I was first here in 1974. I very much value the opportunity I have been given to exchange ideas with President Gorbachev and with a number of political leaders here in Moscow. I was able to listen to Mikhail Gorbachev and ask him questions for 90 minutes—that was how long our meeting lasted. Most of our discussion concerned the dramatic changes produced by perestroyka in the sphere of the economy and national security.

We devoted a considerable amount of our time to questions connected with Lithuania. I hinted to President Gorbachev that President Bush was speaking on behalf of the entire American people when he expressed the strong desire for questions to be settled by peaceful means, and that the use of force would mean discarding a wide range of opportunities for further cooperation. I told the president that this was my impression too. President Gorbachev explained to me that the Soviet Union's position is not to use force as long as there is no threat to other people's lives. He also said that he was devoted to the idea of resolving issues peacefully and wanted to resolve them in ways that accord with the Soviet Constitution.

We also discussed questions of arms cuts. I believe that in the very near future new progress could be achieved on nuclear arms cuts and in removing the concern which the Soviet Union is experiencing in connection with the possible appearance of a united Germany. I understand this concern. I know about the immense suffering and losses which the Soviet Union endured during World War II. I well understand this because I lost a brother in that war.

[Vasilyev] Senator, this is your second meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. What do you think of him as a political leader?

[Kennedy] President Gorbachev is a leader of a different type from the old Soviet leaders we used to know. Over the past few years we have seen how his leadership has led to very important transformations in the USSR and changes of a democratic nature in the East European countries. These are genuinely historic changes. I think that around the world the name of Gorbachev is identified with the peaceful resolution of issues and with dialogue. And that is one of the reasons why he has won enormous respect and admiration not only from other statesmen but from ordinary people worldwide.

[Vasilyev] How do you see the future of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Kennedy] There have been very major changes recently. In the seventies, when I first visited your country, there was a lack of dialogue between our countries. The level of enmity, suspicion, and mistrust was very great. I think that we now have a real dialogue at the top level between elected officials of the two countries. We can see that there is growing progress in areas such as arms control. I personally think that this year we will be able to sign agreements on strategic arms and other types of arms and armed forces. We are also seeing more and more businesslike relations in spheres such as scientific and technical cooperation, trade and economic ties, and cooperation on global problems. All this, I think, is a basis for long-standing progress and mutual understanding. There is a widespread opinion in America that we are on the threshold of a new period and that we are seeing a new day dawn. [passage omitted]

'Inert' U.S. Approach to Afghanistan Noted

PM3003102590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by V. Gan: "Change of Players. American Studies on the Afghan Problem"]

[Text] Washington, 29 Mar—After careful study the Republican research service at the U.S. House of Representatives has finally discovered the root cause of the "ineffectiveness" of U.S. policy on Afghanistan. In the opinion of the service's inquiring minds, this consists in the fact that one of the main mujahidin leaders, G. Hikmatyar, the main recipient of Washington aid... regularly cooperates with the Soviet and Afghan communist authorities and could even be their agent.

An ingenious idea, isn't it? Particularly if you take into consideration the fact that Hikmatyar himself has long had a reputation as a fundamentalist fanatic who has risen within the opposition ranks owing to his hardline attitude to all other views, including moderate views. Many people believe that he was involved in the recent abortive antigovernment coup in Kabul organized by then Defense Minister Tanai. Throughout the war years Hikmatyar has been Pakistan's undisputed favorite.

However, the Republican researchers claim that this is by no means the case. In their opinion, Hikmatyar is engaged in destabilizing and betraying the opposition in cooperation with the USSR and Afghan security services. What is more, he is also involved in anti-American international terrorism...

Attempts to present dreams as reality are always unsuccessful. This is especially true of the administration's Afghan policy: The main paymaster behind the bloody deadlock in Afghanistan—the Congress—has increasingly frequently begun to show signs of dissatisfaction and criticize the White House for its lack of flexibility toward the efforts to achieve a settlement.

At recent hearings in the House of Representatives, J. Kelly, assistant U.S. secretary of state, was told bluntly that the legislature's unconditional support for aid to the mujahidin is beginning to show signs of cracking and could collapse altogether this fall. Representative S. Solarz said in plain terms: "We must recognize that the program which previously enjoyed effectively universal support in the Congress is now subject to serious doubts, particularly in connection with the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and the inaccurate forecasts regarding the inevitable collapse of the Kabul regime." The legislators' increasing questions about the good sense of following the former course did not diminish following the reports of some opposition leaders' involvement in the drugs business, corruption, and misappropriation of U.S. food aid.

The hearings ended unsatisfactorily for the administration—the legislators threatened that they would be forced to examine "alternative options" if the "strategic bankruptcy" of the current policy becomes totally evident.

I will not undertake to judge the weight of geopolitical and strategic considerations in the current inert U.S. approach to Afghanistan. But I think that the dollar factor is playing an increasingly marked role there. It is known almost certainly that Washington's military aid to the Afghan opposition costs a minimum of $600 million a year. The failure of the hopes for a "speedy victory" in Afghanistan and the unforeseen shift of political priorities toward Central America and East

Europe have compelled the Washington credit managers to scratch their heads, because there is no spare money in the coffers and the budget deficit—an extremely emotive problem for the country—by no means inclines them to extravagance.

Now more often than ever you can hear calls on the Potomac for U.S. policy in Afghanistan to be reviewed in favor of efforts to secure a political settlement. The champions of this approach indicate primarily that there must be an end to USSR and U.S. weapons shipments to the combatants in conjunction with a cease-fire and the beginning of talks to settle the conflict. The mediatory role played by the United Nations, which is proposing to broaden the range of Afghan parties to these talks, must be intensified to ensure their success.

But the most important thing is for all sides to approach the elaboration of a political settlement guided by three common aims: the creation of a stable, nonaligned Afghanistan, the return home of more than 5 million refugees from Pakistan and Iran, and the cessation of the civil war. All the rest—the process of establishing power, participation in a coalition government, and other questions—can be decided during the talks.

These would seem to be sensible arguments. But one can see from the Republican research materials that they do not herald the radical revision of U.S. Afghan policy.

U.S. Continues Ideological 'Warfare' With Cuba

LD2803220690 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 28 Mar 90

[By TASS political news analyst Nikolay Chigir]

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—The United States' ideological warfare against Cuba conducted in the area of telecommunications has entered a new state. A TV station created by the U.S. Government began to beam broadcasts in Spanish on Cuba.

Although it was announced in Washington that these are trial broadcasts, they can rightly be assessed as a large-scale hostile action against a sovereign state, the action contradicting norms of international law.

The unlawful character of the activity of the piratic U.S. television station is apparent. Washington's aggression against Cuba in telecommunications area is a gross violation of the declaration on the inadmissiblity of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of states. This declaration was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1981.

The Washington administration does not honour other international obligations it assumed.

It does not observe the International Telecommunication Convention that was signed in Nairobi in 1982 by 130 countries, the United States and Cuba among them. Contrary to the provisions of that convention, the United States began to use the channel of the Havana-based Tele Rebelde station.

It is easy to imagine how telecommunications in the world will be affected if countries will act as the United States and seize channels of others, thus violating sovereignty of other countries. Such unlawful actions will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the situation in separate regions and the world.

The confrontational character of Washington's new anti-Cuban step does nothing to promote tendencies for detente in international relations. This is apparently the policy hostile to Cuba, the stepping up of provocations against Cuba and is not in keeping with the new political thinking.

The world community demands that international exchange in information should promote accord and be based on respect for the interests of all countries concerned and non-interference in internal affairs.

Cuba has this attitude. It is prepared to exchange newsreels and television programmes with other countries. The United States included. Cuba more than once expressed the readiness to achieve mutually-acceptable arrangements with the United States.

Cuba, specifically, expressed consent to international arbitration which would settle differences between Cuba and the United States regarding the TV station.

Cuba is apparently prepared for a reasonable compromise that is not infringing the sovereignty of the sides. The United States, quite the contrary, persists in the anti-Cuban course which can only result in the aggravation of the confrontation with all the negative consequences to follow for the Caribbean Basin and Central America and for the whole world.

China

Li Peng Interviewed on Sino-Soviet Relations

OW0104113990 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 31 Mar 90

["Excerpts" of Li Peng's conversation in Beijing with a visiting Soviet reporters' delegation; no date given—read by announcer]

[Text] Li Peng began his conversation by saying: I will make an official trip to the Soviet Union shortly. The purpose of the trip is to further develop Sino-Soviet relations after they were normalized. These relations cover various areas, including politics, economics, culture, science, and technology, as well as issues pertaining to the reduction of military confrontation along our common border.

Li Peng continued: More specifically, I want to hold talks on expanding and promoting economic cooperation between the two countries during my trip. The possibility of attaining this goal is strong, and the prospects are good, because our economies are complementary. We have what you do not have, and you have what we lack.

Naturally, we also want to exchange extensive views on international issues of common interest. We do not necessarily adopt similar attitudes and work for similar goals. The important thing is to exchange views and opinions so that we can acquire a better and fuller understanding of each other's stance and perspectives.

Li Peng said: Gorbachev made an important trip to China last May. The significance of the trip can be depicted by eight Chinese characters which mean bringing the past to an end and opening up the way to the future. Sino-Soviet relations were normalized during the trip. Generally speaking, the current relationship between the two countries will continue to develop soundly.

The Chinese head of government stated: Our relations can develop at a faster pace. The recent spate of new developments in Europe and the Soviet Union may prevent you from paying due attention to Sino-Soviet relations. Both China and the Soviet Union are carrying out socialist reforms. We have always stressed that taking the socialist road means conducting explorations. Marx and Engels pioneered socialist and communist doctrines. Lenin enriched the doctrines on the basis of the specific characteristics of your country.

In taking the socialist path, it is essential to link theories with the country's specific conditions. There is no perfect model for developing socialism. The Soviet Union and China have their own realities. However, this should not prevent our countries and parties from maintaining normal relations.

Li Peng went on: I have read documents on recent plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee and the resolution of the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies. I got the impression that your country has not discarded socialist ideals. We can exchange opinions on how to advance along the socialist road. Even if your people think that socialism is no longer the ideal system for the Soviet Union, our basic policy will still be aimed at preserving normal state relations with your nation. However, I have not seen any signs indicating that the Soviet Union does not want to take the socialist road.

On the accomplishments of and prospects for the People's Republic of China that recently celebrated its 40th birthday, Li Peng noted emphatically: In the past four decades, China has transformed itself from a semicolonial and semifeudal country into a socialist state. It has reaped initial results in achieving prosperity and strength. The achievements of the past decade have been especially remarkable. During that decade, China implemented a policy of reform and opening to the outside world.

The Third Plenary Session of the CPC Central Committee in 1978 marked a turning point for the process of reform and opening. The session thoroughly corrected the mistakes committed during the Cultural Revolution and laid the foundation for carrying out the policy of reform and opening to the outside world. The policy was designed to do away with the excessive centralization and rigid management in economic construction. By doing so, we brought into full play the initiative of localities in developing industry and commerce and created conditions and possibilities for workers and peasants to display an enterprising spirit.

Everybody knows that reforms in China began in the economic sphere. The economic reforms started with agriculture. In the past, our agriculture was dominated by the collective economy. The collectives that characterized such an economy resembled the kolkhozes [collective farms] in the Soviet Union. When we carried out reforms, we adopted the policy of contracting output quotas to households, after considering the ultimate results of each peasant's labor. Under that policy, we transferred the land, which is the property of society, to peasants for regular use. China produced 150 million metric tons of grain during the year of its liberation, but the figure has now risen to 400 million.

Because of our accomplishments in reforms during the past decade, we now can aim to quadruple our national income and gross national product by the end of this century. The first step was taken to double the national income by the end of 1988. By 1990 we have raised our national income by 1.2-fold. Our overall strength—in economics, science, technology, and other fields—has been enhanced significantly and the people's living standards have improved. In the past, we used to say in China that most people wanted to buy three big commodities: wristwatches, bicycles, and sewing machines. Now, the three big commodities are television sets, refrigerators, and washing machines. These commodities have made extensive inroads into the homes of people in urban and rural areas. There are now approximately 700 million television viewers in China.

The premier continued: Naturally, we have gained both positive and negative experiences during those 40 years of socialist construction. We have incurred failures and committed mistakes. However, these failures and mistakes are of secondary importance when compared with our achievements. The galloping pace of economic development that began in 1985 disrupted the balance between accumulation and consumption and led to serious inflation. Accordingly, we took actions to improve the economic environment and rectify economic order.

Another mistake we made relates to ideological and political work. The primary objective of China's policy of opening to the outside world is to learn from the advanced experiences of developed countries and to master advanced technology. Therefore, we are not against learning the positive elements of foreign cultures.

However, in the course of reform and opening, decadent things gained entry into China along with the good things. Moreover, the development of a commodity economy has sapped the people's desire to seek ideals and led to a decline in public morals.

Li Peng went on: Under the combined influence of factors at home and abroad, turmoil and a rebellion broke out in China last June. The foreign factors came from hostile forces in the West that had never forsaken their attempts to carry out peaceful evolution in China. The domestic factors stemmed from the lax ideological and political work among the people. No measures were taken to resist unhealthy factors and tendencies. Other domestic factors included corruption, bribery, debauchery, abuse of power, and unfair distribution of social wealth.

The CPC Central Committee has held three plenary sessions since the 4 June incident. These sessions placed special emphasis on strengthening ideological and political work, improving the economy, and establishing due order in the economy.

The premier of China's State Council said emphatically: China and the Soviet Union are neighbors that share a border stretching more than 7,000 km. We want to foster friendly and good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, because such relations are vital to peace and development in the Far East and in the world. The peoples of our two countries should live in peace and friendship. I want to take this opportunity to send friendly regards on behalf of the Chinese people to the Soviet citizens.

Li Peng's Upcoming Visit to USSR Previewed

OW0104144890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Commentary by station commentator Nikolayev; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: The date for an international event that draws attention across the world has been set. Beijing has announced that Chinese President [title as heard] Li Peng will visit the Soviet Union at the end of April. Our station commentator Nikolayev writes:

Here we will not speculate on the specific outcome of the upcoming visit to the Soviet Union by the Chinese head of government. However, it is worthwhile to talk about the future and hopes on this occasion.

It is believed that the upcoming Soviet-Chinese talks will be geared toward the following areas; that is, to consolidate the good-neighborly relations and promote economic cooperation between the two countries. But what are the specific topics?

Li Peng, in a meeting with Soviet reporters in Beijing a few days ago, pointed out that when in Moscow, he first would like to discuss economic cooperation. It would be nice if any concrete results could be reached in this respect.

Turning the Soviet-Chinese border into a peaceful and good-neighborly border is believed to be another important topic. Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs Qian Qichen stated at a press conference on 28 March that China hopes to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on a mutual reduction of border troops so as to conform with the normal relations between the two countries. In other words, the Chinese premier's upcoming Moscow visit is aimed at going beyond what was achieved in last May's summit meeting and bringing new substance to it.

Both Moscow and Beijing believe that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is beneficial in all aspects. One immediate and apparent advantage is that the people of the two neighboring countries all feel secure with each other, which, in fact, means that the two countries now can spare the money and materials spent in the past in their military confrontation and use it for constructive purposes. This provides concrete meaning to the theory that talks on normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations are in the interests of the people of the two countries and are conducive to promoting peace in Asia and the world as a whole.

Both countries realize that peace and development are the main issues of the day. Of course, it is possible there will be differences on certain issues. It is likely that there will be mutual understanding as well as opposing views during Chinese Premier Li Peng's upcoming visit to the Soviet Union.

Wang Renzhi-Led Delegation Continues Visit

OW0104110090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] A delegation of the CPC Central Committee headed by Wang Renzhi, member of the CPC Central Committee, continued its visit to the Soviet Union. In Kiev, (?Kryuchkov), secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, met with the Chinese party workers. During their friendly conversation, (?Kryuchkov) briefed the guests on Ukraine's social, political, and economic situation. He stressed that the majority of the Communist Party members in Ukraine have not voiced any views different from the CPSU's. However, he said, the Ukrainian Communist Party should solve its internal problems independently.

The head of the Chinese delegation called for strengthening mutual understanding and support between the CPC and CPSU. He said this is very important to the further development of relations between China and the Soviet Union.

Wang Renzhi Interviewed

OW0104122190 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] A CPC delegation headed by Wang Renzhi, member of the CPC Central Committee and head of the Propaganda Department, visited the Soviet Union from 19 to 29 March. The following is an interview with Wang Renzhi by NOVOYE VREMYA.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] The visit [to China] by Soviet leader Gorbachev marked the normalization of relations between the two countries and the two parties. Would you please say a few words about the development of party-to-party relations since then?

[Wang] Relations between the two parties have been developing in line with the spirit of the agreements reached at the meeting between Comrade Deng Xiaoping and Gorbachev. We attach great importance to relations between the two parties and have worked hard to promote ties between the two parties. This conforms to the interests of the Chinese and Soviet people and will enrich the experience of the international workers' movement. To maintain good relations between the two parties, we believe that we must abide by the principle of mutual respect, equality, and noninterference in each others' internal affairs. We will abide by this principle.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] The plenary session of the CPC Central Committee held between 9 and 12 March adopted a decision on strengthening the ties between the party and the people. Why did you turn your attention to this question?

[Wang] The purpose of our party is to serve the people and bring benefits to the people. Strengthening the ties between the party and the people is an important part of our work. At the same time, it is possible that the party might become divorced from the masses. We will strengthen the flesh-and-blood ties with the people. By relying on the masses, we will be able to overcome the difficulties facing us.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] China has been carrying out reform for over a decade. In recent years, it has encountered many difficulties. What is the current situation?

[Wang] We are continuing to implement the policy of reform. Experience shows that there is no other way. Experience also shows that if we deviate from the socialist road, there will be no future for reform. We are working hard to ensure that reform will follow the socialist road.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Last summer, many capitalist countries imposed economic sanctions on China. In your opinion, what are the prospects of China's relations with Western nations?

[Wang] China's relations with Western nations are not decided entirely by us. We will develop relations with these nations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Our position on economic sanctions by Western nations is clear-cut: First, we oppose such measures. Second, we are not afraid of sanctions. Third, we will continue to carry out reform and expand the policy of developing relations with the outside world.

USSR, China Discuss Hard-Currency Trade

LD0104105190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0550 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Beijing, 1 April (TASS)—China and the Soviet Union are currently discussing ways of moving away from barter trade to trade transactions based on hard currency. This was disclosed at a press conference in Biejing by Li Langing, the vice minister for foreign economic relations and trade. The minister expressed optimism about the prospects for the development of bilateral business ties as a whole.

This optimism, the Chinese representative noted, is based, first and foremost, on the mutually complemetary nature of trade between the two countries. However, he stressed, this advantage "is not fully exploited" because of two obstacles, one of which is in fact the barter method of trade. As a result of this, both sides are trying to drop barter trade in those goods which can earn hard currency in other markets.

The second obstacle, according to Li Langing, is the fact that trade is based primarily on intergovernmental agreements, although a number of other channels have appeared in recent years. The transition to trade transactions based on hard currency will help eliminate both obstacles, the Chinese representative said. He also disclosed that beginning next year similar measures will be taken in China's trade with the countries of Eastern Europe. "Both in China and in the countries of Eastern Europe big changes have taken place in recent years in economic structures. Barter trade within the framework of intergovernmental agreements accords less and less with the changing situation," said Li Langing, who also acknowledged that the transition to new trading relations might initially be accompanied by a decline in trade turnover. However, he said, "in the long term" the changes will serve the development of trade between the partners.

Commentaries Discuss Nature of Sino-Soviet Ties

Termed 'Non-Ideological'

OW2603203290 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Commentary by Alekseyev; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, while paying an official visit to India a few days ago, Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs Qian Qichen said that China was eager to develop friendly and good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union. He stressed that Premier Li Peng's forthcoming visit to the USSR in April will help achieve this objective. In this connection, our station observer Alekseyev writes:

The Soviet position toward the prospects of Soviet-Chinese relations remains the same. This can be observed from the remarks made by Soviet President Gorbachev at a press conference a few days ago. He said that Premier Li Peng's visit to the USSR will be an important event which will undoubtedly enhance the development of Soviet-Chinese relations. Gorbachev stressed: We highly evaluate and cherish such relations and will make every effort to expedite their development.

I want to remind you listeners to take note of an experience which I think is a reliable guarantee for solid Soviet-Chinese relations. Certain older listeners may remember the political [word indistinct] which appeared along with the development of Soviet-Chinese relations during the 1950's. In those days people seemed to believe that no force in the world could shake the friendly ties between our two countries.

However, Soviet-Chinese relations in those days were built on a foundation which could not actually ensure their stability. What I mean is, first of all, that both the Soviet Union and China held identical positions and views on all issues relevant to their internal and external policies. In those days, such a unanimity was regarded as a law and an ideological (?necessity). Then, because of reasons known to all, differences occurred between the USSR and China. Both Moscow and Beijing maintained that the other side had committed ideological errors, and such a belief led to their tense bilateral relations.

Fortunately, we have learned a lot over these many years, and it is unlikely that similar changes will reoccur in Soviet-Chinese relations today. When Gorbachev visited China in May 1989, leaders of our two countries clearly stated that Soviet-Chinese relations should be built on a foundation which is totally non-ideological. Indeed, Moscow and Beijing should have their own views toward certain international issues. And why should this matter? Both the USSR and China are major countries in the world. It is very natural that their interests are not exactly identical. What is important is both sides will work hard to coordinate these interests, expand the scope of mutual understanding, and seek solutions acceptable to both sides so that their difference of views will not obstruct the development of their good-neighborliness.

The Soviet Union and China [word indistinct] hold this position regarding their bilateral relations. Life has already proved that this stand has yielded fruitful results. We have every reason to believe that non-ideological principles will become effective factors contributing to the stable and rapid development of Soviet-Chinese good-neighborliness and cooperation. I am convinced that such prospects are in line with the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples.

Importance of Interparty Ties

OW0204094890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Commentary by station observer Alekseyev; from the "Asian Affairs" program]

[Text] The CPC wishes to promote mutual understanding and cooperation with the CPSU. This was announced recently in the Ukrainian capital of Kiev by Wang Renzhi, member of the CPC Central Committee and head of a Chinese party affairs delegation. Our station observer Alekseyev has the following comments on this matter:

Wang Renzhi's announcement, like the visit to the Soviet Union by the Chinese party affairs delegation, is further proof of the development of the course started by Comrade Gorbachev when he visited China last May. At that time, the Soviet and Chinese leaders reached agreement on resuming interparty ties. The agreement has been executed now through various concrete measures. Here I wish to mention that a CPC delegation led by Zhu Liang, head of the International Liaison Department of the CPC Central Committee, visited Moscow last fall. In December, that is, on the eve of the New Year, talks were held in Beijing between a Soviet party delegation headed by Falin, chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and responsible personnel of the CPC Central Committee.

In the various fields in which there are Soviet-Chinese contacts, interparty ties are of particular importance because contradictions between the CPSU and the CPC caused the long period of estrangement in Soviet-Chinese relations in past years. Here I wish to point out how Soviet-Chinese interparty ties differ in principle from the cooperation that existed between the CPSU and the CPC during the 1950's. At that time, the dominant idea in both Moscow and Beijing was that the two parties should share an entirely identical view. In their opinion, because the Soviet and Chinese Communists had the same ideology, they should not assess this or that from different stands. This dogmatist attitude finally led to the discontinuance of relations between the two parties.

However, both the Soviet Union and China have drawn the proper conclusion from the past experience. The following understanding was reaffirmed during Comrade Gobachev's visit to China: All communist parties are independent. None holds the supreme truth and none should impose its idea on others. This understanding is the basis for the CPSU-CPC ties at the present stage. Undoubtedly, such ties are in the interests of the further development of the good-neighborly and cooperative relations between the Soviet Union and China. They also are a factor in the vigorous promotion of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and in all parts of the world.

Northeast Asia

TASS Chief Meets Japanese Foreign Minister

PM3003104590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Tokyo, 29 Mar—Japanese Foreign Minister T. Nakayama has received L.P. Kravchenko, general director of TASS, who is visiting here.

During the conversation T. Nakayama pointed out that people in Japan have a positive opinion of the processes of perestroyka in various spheres of the life of Soviet society.

Speaking about USSR-Japanese relations, T. Nakayama expressed the opinion that both sides should make persistent efforts to broaden bilateral ties. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan could be an important boost for the onward development of relations between our two countries, the Japanese minister stressed.

N.N. Solovyev, USSR ambassador to Japan, was present during the conversation.

Anniversary of Soviet-DPRK Ties Marked

SK2603112090 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 22 Mar 90

[From the "Annals of Friendship" program]

[Text] A meeting to celebrate the 41st anniversary of the signing of the USSR-DPRK agreement on economic and cultural cooperation was held in the Hall of Culture in Moscow on 15 March. The meeting was attended by representatives of social circles in Moscow and by DPRK Embassy staff members.

In his report, (Nikolay Tarasov), a member of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society Central Committee, said that the agreement signed 41 years ago opened a way for full-scale relations between the two countries.

At the meeting, Kim Hui-su, DPRK charge d'affairs ad interim in the Soviet Union, delivered a reply speech.

Bilateral, Other Trade With ROK Examined

SK0104065390 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Report from Tokyo by TASS reporter (Vladimir Sonsev)]

[Text] The trade volume that has doubled during the last year between the Soviet Union and South Korea does not necessarily mean that it has reached its limit. The two countries,which are mutually complementary in terms of economic structure, have at their disposal great potential for expanding the (?scope) of trade and scientific and technological ties even further.

This was the central theme in a joint communique released at the conclusion of a second joint meeting between Soviet and South Korean businessmen on 28 March.

In the second joint meeting in Seoul which lasted for a week, Golanov, chairman of the USSR-ROK Council for Economic Cooperation council, led the Soviet delegation; and Chong Chu-yong, president of the ROK-Soviet Economic Association, headed the South Korean delegation. The delegations noted the progress made in the development of the bilateral relations. In other words, the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry has opened its mission in Seoul and the ROK Trade Promotion Association opened its mission in Moscow; the two countries have opened consular departments inside their respective missions; the Soviet-ROK Council for Economic Cooperation and the ROK-Soviet Economic Association have been established; four major South Korean business firms have opened representative missions in the Soviet Union; negotiations between the Soviet Union and South Korea over the opening of the office of [word indistinct] (?Intorv) in Seoul; an agreement on opening direct air route has already been reached; an exhibition of the ROK goods was held in the Soviet Union; and an exhibition of Soviet goods is scheduled for this coming May in Seoul. In this way, an organizational foundation has been laid for Soviet-South Korean business ties. This means that the economic cooperation between the two countries has entered a second stage.

In was noted in the meeting that bilateral trade is growing rapidly. Trade with the ROK, the second biggest trade partner among the socialist countries next to China, grew to about $600 million last year from $290 million in 1988. Nevertheless, this figure accounts for a fraction of the total trade volume of the two countries. At present, in many areas the exchange of goods between the two countries is handled via third countries.

The two countries have mutually promised to make joint efforts to increase trade volume and improve the structure to the level of exchanging finished goods and technological processes. They have agreed on activating [word indistinct] in the area of investment and cooperation.

In addition, the two sides have expressed opinions that it is reasonable to create legal devices to provide guarantees for the purpose of encouraging mutual investment, including joint ventures and special economic zones, avoid double taxation, and take other such steps to improve conditions for investment.

The Soviet side has handed over to the South Korean delegation a (?list of) proposed projects that can make mutual cooperation possible inside the Soviet territory, in Siberia, and the Soviet Far East in the first place. The two countries possess considerable potential for developing mutual cooperation in such fields as light industry, electronic industry, shipbuilding industry, forestry, and [word indistinct].

The two sides concurred in the view that it is reasonable to combine the Soviet Union's scientific and technological successes with the potential available from South Korean business firms. This will contribute to modernizing the economics of the two countries.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Australian Envoy Received at Foreign Ministry

PM2603131990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ambassador Received"]

[Text] V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received C.R. Ashwin, Australian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request 22 March.

Official Addresses 'Asia Defense-90' Conference

LD2103183190 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 21 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Tsyganov]

[Text] Kuala Lumpur March 21 TASS—The "Asia Defence-90" conference, which opened here today, is being held under the motto "Defence for the Asian-Pacific region's development", reflecting the essence of changes now occurring in the international arena.

The conference, attended by more than 300 delegates from 20 countries, promises to be an important event in the region. Views on ways to stabilise defence interests and socio-economic development will be expressed by Filipino Defence Minister Fidel Ramos, Indonesian State Minister for Research and Technology B.J. Habibi and many other prominent regional statesmen and political leaders. The conference is being attended by representatives of the USSR, United States, China and Great Britain.

"Radical changes in Soviet military thinking have shifted the Soviet military doctrine's accent to more defensive positions," assistant director of the Soviet Oriental Studies Institute G.I. Chufrin stressed. "These changes in Soviet military strategy and its concrete policy in Asia may be accelerated or, on the contrary, slowed down by the reaction they receive from other states in the region, primarily the United States, China and Japan.

"The Soviet Union," he stressed, "is seriously concerned about the U.S. refusal to start negotiations on the reduction of naval forces and about America's desire to perpetuate its superiority over the USSR in this domain. The policy of the Soviet Union in the Asian-Pacific region is linked not only with maintaining security, but also with creating there favourable conditions for safeguarding peace and stability," the Soviet expert said.

Near East & South Asia

Moscow Comments on Political Changes in Iran

NC3003191190 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: Now during the new year festival, political life in Iran grinds to a standstill in practice, and government and parliamentary organizations are in the midst of the new year holidays. The political storms of 1368 [year beginning 21 March 1989] have been relegated to history.

In these days, the political leadership of the Islamic republic seems to be resting after the violent political turbulence of 1368. Last year was to a great extent a year in which the country's history changed immensely and which transformed the face of Iran. First of all, 1368 was the year without Khomeyni, whose demise at its beginning culminated in crucial changes in the country's political situation.

This does not refer to the permutations in the Iranian leadership alone. In fact, immediately after the imam's demise, a low-keyed campaign for protecting the purity and spirit of the Islamic revolution began. Ostensibly, this campaign was apparent in a considerable change in the Islamic Republic's governmental structure.

In 1368, the reins of government, which had previously been gathered completely in Khomeyni's hands, were appropriately apportioned among three centers—the religious leader, the president, and the Islamic Majlis. This came about after a referendum on the reappraisal of the Constitution. The amended text incorporated in the Constitution first of all resulted in considerably bolstering the rule of the president in Iran, a position assumed by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani in August last year.

A large number of Iranians had great expectations, which cannot be termed attainable or realistic, for Hashemi-Rafsanjani. Combining adherence to Imam Khomeyni's policies with expert and gradual changes became the new president's political course of action in 1368. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani rallied all his political experience and his spirit of pragmatism, of which all are well aware, so that he could make his beliefs and ideas materialize. Foremost, definite changes were made in the fabric of his government, which was formed in the middle of last year. In general, it was not religious clerics but expert specialists in various social or economic fields who became members of the cabinet of ministers. It is not a coincidence that the new cabinet was immediately labeled a technocrats' cabinet. Thus 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani to a great extent deviated from the tradition earlier evident in Iran of having religious scholars absolutely dominate all spheres of administrative life.

Optimists in Tehran, who have never made up the majority, consider this the beginning of the growth of an effective and pragmatic leadership whose members are proponents of opening the doors to the outside world and of abstaining from the violently extremist actions of the first years of the Islamic revolution.

For socio-economic reforms in Iran like providing an impetus to private economic activity, a new motivation surfaced in 1368. However, this also resulted in a definite rift in the upper political echelons of the Islamic Republic. Despite the enormous effort to maintain a semblance of overt unity, a difference of opinion was observed on numerous issues ranging from specifying the level of government control over the country's economy to establishing ties with the West.

Signs of a mitigation in the tension which had become so obvious in 1368 intimidated the Islamic conservatives to a great extent. If in the beginning of the year they had a general campaign against the women who had chosen to wear colorful headscarves instead of black ones and against the people who favored modern music, their campaign later became directed toward leveling political accusations.

Words about flouting or ignoring Imam Khomeyni's ideas and thoughts reached the people's ears. Likewise, there was censuring over the propagation of American-style Islam. Threats of dismissal were increasingly vocalized. Ayatollah Ahmad Azari-Qomi became the focus for overt differences. At the Friday prayers in Tehran, he said: Support for the Islamic regime is more important than religious duties, which can also be waived. These remarks elicited a strong reaction from Majlis Speaker Mehdi Karrubi who threatened that he would take to the streets to elaborate on the imam's ideas.

The situation came to such a head that 'Ali Khamene'i asked all the people to refrain from making comments which might result in dissent. He instructed all the Armed Forces personnel to continue to defend the revolution's gains with arms. The dispute described above was most representative of the year 1368, as it pivoted on adherence to Khomeyni's legacy. Iran's image depends on how this dispute is concluded.

In 1368, success was achieved in maintaining a specific situation in relations among the various factions of the ruling regime, and whims and desires subsided momentarily. However, as before, the dispute was not resolved in principle. It therefore appears that in the future, a campaign consisting of irreconcilable views to preserve the revolutionary spirit of Iran in the new post-Khomeyni era will continue.

Border Crossing Agreements Signed With Iran

NC2503110590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Text] It was reported earlier that, acting in accordance with the instructions of the republic's government, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Foreign Affairs proposed to Iran early in 1990 that the two sides consider the question of signing documents related to simplifying contacts between the citizens of the two republics. Iran supported the proposal and the republic's ministry of foreign affairs acted in accordance with this arrangement and drew up draft agreements. The agreements were conveyed to the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran to be studied.

As a result of mutual consultations, two documents were signed in Tehran on 15 February 1990. The two documents are a memorandum between the USSR Government and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the agreement reached on the conditions under which mutual visits will be arranged to allow the citizens of the two countries to meet with their relatives and to allow mutual visits on the basis of invitations, and a memorandum on the agreement reached between the USSR Government and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to simplify the rules which apply to the crossing by citizens living in the border rayons of the border between the two countries. The first document was put into effect on the day it was signed. The second will be put into effect after the two countries exchange notes informing each other that they are prepared to put this memorandum into effect. Meanwhile, plans have been made to renovate the border checkpoints in the border regions and construct buildings which will be used by the border and customs administrations. Plans have also been made to construct buildings for subsistence services and cultural installations.

The two countries are now carrying out preparatory work. However, considering the importance of the new year festival and the wish of the people living in Azerbaijan's border rayons to visit their relatives and friends in Iran during the festive days, the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs proposed to Iran to consider the matter until the pertinent memorandum is put into effect and regard it as an exceptional situation which confirms the wish to strengthen the goodwill and good-neighborly relations between the two countries.

Iran approved the proposal made by the republic's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. With this in mind, the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs made preparations in that regard. It approved the preparation of an additional 50,000 national passports for the citizens to allow them to cross the border, and sent them to the 17 border rayons of the republic.

Four of the six crossing points considered in the pertinent memorandum were made ready in Astaras, (?Blasuva), Dzhul'fa, and Khoradiz and were used on 21, 22, and 23 March. The local soviets of these rayons carried out significant organizational and economic work. Tens of thousands of the citizens of our republic's border rayons had the opportunity to meet with their relatives and close friends during the festival.

Lukyanov To Visit India 4-8 April

LD0204131590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1219 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 Apr (TASS)—It has been officially announced here that at the invitation of the Indian leadership, Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member, will go to the Republic of India on an official visit on 4-8 April 1990.

Dzasokhov Meets With Afghan Parliamentarians

PM2903114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] The Soviet Union's invariable support for the policy of national reconciliation pursued by the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan was expressed on 26 March during a meeting between A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, and a delegation of the Republic of Afghanistan national parliamentary group headed by Shakh Aliakbar Shakhrestani [name as transliterated], deputy chairman of the Afghan National Council senate.

Vorontsov Receives Lebanese Ambassador

PM2903122590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, met M. Hamud, ambassador of the Republic of Lebanon to the Soviet Union, and had a conversation with him in connection with the completion of the latter's tour of duty.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Comments on Recent Africa Trip

'Profound Changes' Occurring

LD3003135590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 March (TASS)—Profound changes are taking place in southern Africa and on the continent as a whole, dictating the need for fundamentally new approaches and for the building of relations with the states of the region on new foundations. This was declared by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shavardnadze in a conversation with TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev following his return from a trip to seven African countries. During the trip, he visited, Angola, Zambia, and Namibia, where he attended the ceremonies marking the proclamation of the country's independence, as well as Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and Nigeria.

Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized that relations with Africa must be determined by dialogue rather than confrontation, and by a shift from cooperation to interaction. In the minister's view a new stage has now begun in Soviet-African ties, within the framework of which it is necessary, in the first instance, to develop economic cooperation.

The minister considers that, at the present time, good prospects have taken shape for resolving such acute problems of the region as the internal conflicts in Angola and Mozambique. The talks with the leaders of these countries that took place during the trip convince one of their readiness to do everything possible to promote national reconciliation. A constructive role in settling the conflicts will be played, in his view, by the appearance of an independent Namibia on the political map of the continent.

The possibility, which is now a realistic one, of the dismantling of the apartheid system in the Republic of South Africa [RSA] will provide an impetus to the development of the situation in southern Africa, Eduard Shevardnadze thinks. The meetings and conversations that took place in Windhoek with leaders of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa—primarily with Nelson Mandela, but also with RSA President Frederik de Klerk—make this prospect a realistic one.

The Soviet Union, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed in conclusion, is ready to assist the process and to take all necessary measures toward a peaceful settlement in the region and toward the further development and improvement of interaction and cooperation with the countries of Africa.

New Relations Needed

LD3103170290 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has ended a tour of a number of African countries. On his way back home he granted an interview to journalists who accompanied him. Radio Moscow's correspondent Oleg Shchedrov has sent in excerpts from the interview.

The first question concerned the Soviet Union's relations with the developing countries.

[Shevardnadze in Russian, fading into English translation] We believe, the Soviet foreign minister said, that we need a new kind of relations with the developing world. There was a time when the Soviet Union was associated with the struggle against colonialism and the liberation of those countries from colonial yoke. We rendered material, loyal and military assistance and spent a great deal on that. Today our capabilities are limited. We all know the conditions we live in and the situation in our economy. At the same time we are reluctant to put the emphasis on military cooperation or to build our policies on it. For that reason we are faced with the task of formulating new principles of relations with the developing world. What options are most likely? I would name economic cooperation first. I don't share the view that we must denounce our commitments to the third world or our cooperation with it. This is a primitive approach. I would say that this is a superpower attitude. We cannot do this. We must think not only in terms of today but of tomorrow, and we must think about future generations.

[Announcer] Still, what can be done about arms sales? Some critics have been saying that this kind of cooperation is immoral. Eduard Shevardnadze:

[Shevardnadze] In general we should not seek to curtail military cooperation. We must conduct a dialogue with our partners. We must discuss the problem of defense sufficiency, how many arms this or that country should have. Our partners have reacted adequately to this attitude. They are aware that they cannot go on waging wars forever. Angola has spent 20 billion dollars on war and Mozambique, which is a poor country, has wasted 15 billion dollars. They understand that they need peace and that they cannot keep arming themselves. For that reasons the principle of defense sufficiency must be discussed in earnest. The military threat in the region has been diminishing. Democratization is underway in South Africa. The risk of a war has been reducing. This is a prerequisite for cutting arms sales. On the other hand, if we abandon cooperation in the military field now that would be unfair towards our partners. As long as armies and weapons exist there will be military cooperation.

[Announcer] Another question concerned foreign debts. How can the money invested into the third world, including those invested by the Soviet Union, be recovered?

[Shevardnadze] We are members of the international community. Foreign debt problems will be discussed at a special session of the United Nations General Assembly. The decisions it will make will be mandatory for all. Imagine that there is a debt that can never be paid. What can be done now? It's no use filing lawsuits at the International Court or appealing to the United Nations. Other options must be looked for, for instance, economic cooperation. Our partners must get something in return and we, too, will have certain benefits.

[Announcer] None of Eduard Shevardnadze's meetings during his African tour avoided touching upon the situation in South Africa and activities by President Frederik de Klerk.

[Shevardnadze] I'm not sure whether President de Klerk will be consistent enough, whether he will have the power to complete what he has conceived. I Believe in his sincerity, but I fear that he may confine himself to facelifting reforms. Yet I tend to believe that now that he has made a bold step he cannot backtrack.

[Announcer] Should not the Soviet Union furnish support for him by opening channels for contacts?

[Shevardnadze] That's a difficult question. We have been considering that option. However, the general feeling in the world is—and exceptions are rare—that pressure on South Africa and sanctions should continue. Some leaders have been saying that these sanctions would help the South African president in his struggle with the right-wingers. They are an additional incentive to a dialogue with the African National Congress and to dismantling apartheid. Establishing diplomatic relations, opening consulates and conducting trade through the Chamber of Commerce is very easy technically. This delicate question has to be considered thoroughly. I believe that apartheid will be brought down before long. We must consider how we should build relations on a bilateral and trilateral basis, the more so since we already have friends in Africa.

De Klerk Discusses Perestroyka in South Africa

LD3003220790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1805 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Interview with South African President De Klerk by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; interview conducted in English with Russian subtitles; from the "View" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Namibia, the "View" program in Africa. This is the first interview the South African president has ever given to Soviet television.

Reformer Frederic de Klerk was elected president not long ago. Since then his policy of perestroyka of the apartheid regime has had serious opponents. He has been criticized by both white conservatives and black radicals.

[Correspondent] The British prime minister, Mr. Churchill, once said: I do not want to preside over the British empire's destruction. What do you think, are you a loser or a winner in this game?

[De Klerk] I think in the game of reform and of restructuring a constitution, there should not be winners or losers. We are looking for a new constitution in South Africa that will have the support of all the sections of our total population, that will offer quality freedom to everybody and that will not take away from existing rights but which will add rights to those who still do not have full political rights.

[Correspondent] One more question: The Soviet Union has national problems which are very much like racial problems in South Africa. Could you, in a few words, exchange some experience you have got there?

[De Klerk] There are definite similarities in the problems President Gorbachev faces and those we face in South Africa. There are also important differences. We discussed that with the foreign minister of Russia [as heard] in depth, and yes, we hope that also the reform programs of President Gorbachev will have great success.

[Correspondent] Thank you very much. [video shows "View" announcer Lyubimov in South African milieu; Shevardnadze and De Klerk shaking hands; De Klerk surrounded by people, answering questions; the English-speaking correspondent not shown]

Ethiopia Decides To Postpone Socialist Aim

PM2703104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent Sergey Demidov dispatch under the rubric "A Correspondent Comments": "Symbolism and...the Threat of Collapse"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, March—...Only yesterday nothing unusual caught the eye. But since this morning something has changed. But what?

These thoughts importunately crowded into my head and would give me no peace as I walked around Addis Ababa's Revolution Square, where mass processions and meetings are usually held. And only when I turned from it, frozen in some amazement, did I understand what precisely had changed: The "triune" portrait of Marx, Engels, and Lenin had disappeared. It had been dismantled.

Two days before this, during a people's demonstration supporting the new policy of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, which was announced by the 11th Plenum of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee, none of the demonstrators was gripping a party flagpole in his hands any more.

Local newspapers applied the epithet "historic" to the plenum which took place. At the plenum, having assessed the social and political situation currently prevailing in the republic and analyzed the reasons for economic ills and the complex military situation endangering Ethiopia's fortunes, above all in the North, the Central Committee members agreed with the idea expressed by the country's leader that for Ethiopia the transition to a socialist system is a task for the distant future. Based on the realities existing in the republic, the plenum formulated an immediate strategic goal—to release the tight vice of age-old backwardness.

The fact is that, while already holding the sad "title" of being one of the least developed states on earth, Ethiopia is sliding ever lower down the rungs of the world economic ladder. As a result of this, social hardships are being aggravated. The "tails" of waiting lines have lengthened at the doors of state shops, where prices are lower compared with prices in private stores; bottlenecks in supply are increasingly frequent, and unemployment is growing.

According to the schemes announced at the plenum, key economic factors must be mobilized in order to save the country.

It was decided to lay special stress not only on developing the state sector, but also on encouraging private enterprise to the utmost. The "ceilings" on the amounts of individual capital investments in any branch of industry or agrarian production are being abolished. The "green light" has also been given to foreign investors in the Ethiopian economy, and to the setting up of joint enterprises with foreign firms and of joint-stock companies. The cooperative movement will also receive an extra boost.

The role of production regulator is allotted, as the Ethiopian leader stated, not to blind market forces, but to the state through the national plan.

However, these intentions run the risk of remaining unrealized for as long as the situation in the country is not successfully stabilized.

Confrontation between the central authorities and the opposition has entered an even more destructive phase. In February the cease-fire observed de facto since last summer between the government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] was broken. Well-armed EPLF detachments renewed military activities against government forces. They launched a major offensive on the Eritrean city of Mits'iwa.

The city's defenders—Army units and the Navy—suffered appreciable losses in the bitter battle. Nine ships were sunk. Within a week Mits'iwa was reduced to ruins.

Neither is the situation any better in northeast Ethiopia. Ever since another group opposing the government—the Tigre People's Liberation Front [TPLF]—several times seized the city of Debre Tabor, which is practically isolated from all the rest of the republic in the province of South and North Gonder. The situation became even more complicated in the first days of March.

The war is severing traditional economic links between various regions, while the conflagration annually "devours" over 50 percent of the state budget, according to official Ethiopian data. The specter of collapse hangs over the country. The WPE Central Committee plenum reaffirmed the authorities' readiness for dialogue with all forces in opposition.

...A canvas depicting the Ethiopian leader with the people's masses behind him has been fixed to the masonry of the old wall which towers over the capital's Revolution Square. The symbolism implicit in it is clear. What is not clear is when peace will finally reign over Ethiopia's highlands and its sun-scorched lowlands.

East Europe

Modrow Gives Interview on German Unification

PM3003212490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with H. Modrow, head of the GDR "coalition government," by IZVESTIYA special correspondents S. Kondrashov and V. Lapskiy in Berlin: "Hans Modrow: 'We Are Not Going Empty-Handed'"—date of interview not stated; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Berlin—In a short time H. Modrow's coalition government will give way to a new government headed by the Christian Democrats. The months packed with dramatic events which changed the destiny of the GDR are in the past. The outlines of its unification with the FRG are emerging increasingly clearly. What is the GDR taking into a united Germany? How does it see unification? What assessment can be made of the path traveled in recent months? Hans Modrow, who was elected to the new Volkskammer on the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS] list, answers questions from IZVESTIYA's correspondents.

[Correspondents] How do you assess the domestic political situation in the GDR today?

[Modrow] The development of events in the GDR has passed through several stages since I became head of the government in November. In the first stage the democratization process proceeded at a rapid pace, clearing a way and space for itself. At the same time, at this stage, there was a growing awareness that the domestic political situation was rapidly losing stability. A new phase set in with the formation of the "roundtable," characterized by open access to democratic forces and transformations taking place in society. In January the development of events took a turn in which domestic political tension gave rise to the need to form a government of national responsibility. Talks were held on 28 January with the participation of all parties and movements that met at the "roundtable." A consensus was reached for the formation of such a government. It was able to strengthen stability and brought forward the date of the parliamentary elections to 18 March, having created all the necessary conditions for holding the elections. The elections took place—the first free elections in the GDR's history.

[Correspondents] What stages will the unification of Germany have undergo, and how long, in your opinion, will it take? What guarantees can there be against attempts to change the European borders?

[Modrow] The problems of unification are in the forefront. In November I proposed the creation of a contractual community between the GDR and the FRG. A short time later Chancellor H. Kohl read out his 10-point unification program in the Bundestag. In December we were still proceeding on the basis that the contractual community would be the first phase in the unification process and that it would develop into a confederation—that was the path we intended to follow. However, events developed in such a way that by January a new concept was needed. At the end of January, at the time of my meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, it was stated that the USSR does not intend to place any obstacles in the path of unification, on the condition that it takes place within the framework of the all-European process, guarantees European security, and does not affect existing borders. On 1 January I put forward an initiative, which I called "For Germany—a Single Fatherland." It outlined a phased process. Today the situation is such that there is no synchronization with the all-European process.

Whereas prior to the 18 March elections Chancellor Kohl was talking about a rapid pace of unification, it is clear to everyone today that what is needed is careful consideration, coordination of internal processes, the growing together of the two states, and again, synchronization with the European process. In this respect great significance is attached to the consultations which have become known as "two plus four." The position of our immediate neighbors must also be taken into account. Poland and France emphasize the need to maintain the inviolability of the existing borders, and demand guarantees on this point.

[Correspondents] During your latest visit to Moscow, three weeks ago, you said that in the course of phased progress toward unification, account must be taken of the GDR's unique socioeconomic, cultural, and spiritual nature, as well as the character of its international ties and commitments. What, in your view, will the GDR be taking into a united Germany? What advice would you give the new coalition government in this respect?

[Modrow] I will refrain from giving advice. The new government will form its own political concepts. I stand by what I said in Moscow, and also at the press conference in Bonn on 13 February. We are not going into unification empty-handed; the GDR can bring great material assets—the economy, land, the working people's high level of skills, and their zeal. The GDR's cultural assets are of significance not only for Germany, but for Europe and the whole world. We naturally expect our social achievements will also be taken into account in the process of unification, such as the protection of the family, the ramified network of kindergartens and creches, and young people's equal rights to education. All this should find a place in a unified Germany.

[Correspondents] At the present stage of the unification process not only has everyone accepted the so-called "two plus four" mechanism, which has begun to operate, but also what you could call the "two plus 33" mechanism, that is, all the participants in the all-European process who are interested in one way or another in the German question. Could you tell us, in a little more detail, what you think about this?

[Modrow] The "two plus four" mechanism envisages primarily that the responsibility for the unification of the two German states and their fusion rests on the two states themselves and at the same time on the four allied powers. After all, a peace treaty has not yet been signed, the task of creating a peaceful order still stands, and this is a subject under discussion between the two German states in the course of their unification and the allied powers. As I have said, this process cannot be separated from the all-European process. It seems to me that today it is necessary to make greater efforts to create suitable conditions for the holding of a "Helsinki-2" all-European conference. In the interests of the European peoples it is necessary to embark forthwith on concrete, constructive preparations for it. In the first instance it is necessary to devote efforts to the preparation and holding of the "two plus four" conference, and then, immediately after or— even better—in parallel with it, to prepare for "Helsinki-2."

[Correspondents] The unification of Germany will inevitably lead to changes in the structure of relations with the Soviet Union, which, as is well known, holds an important place in trade and cooperation with the two German states. How do you think these relations will develop in the future? How should they be changed and improved?

[Modrow] I would like to look at this question from the viewpoint of mutual interests, taking into account all three sides—the GDR, the FRG, and the USSR. For you, the GDR is the biggest economic partner within CEMA, while in the Western world the FRG is just such a partner for the USSR. Trade relations among the three countries have proved mutually beneficial in recent years. The mutual interest will persist in the future. The economy of the GDR, or of that part of a united Germany that our republic now occupies, will continue to have a very great interest in stable links with the USSR. The economic structures of our two countries have become so closely interwoven that any attempt to separate them will be seriously detrimental to you and to us. The Federal Republic, for its part, has always had an interest in possible markets, and primarily the Soviet market. This is what I think we must do: You in the Soviet Union and we in the GDR must not merely talk about the development of a market economy, but prepare really solidly for transferring the economy onto a new footing.

[Correspondents] What fate do you predict for the PDS, of which you are honorary chairman?

[Modrow] You are asking a question which time will answer. I am not a prophet. The PDS is basically a new party which holds an autonomous place in the GDR's political system as the third biggest political force. It is preparing to fulfill the role of constructive opposition and thereby to contribute to the resolution of the most important questions, first and foremost German unification and the switch to a social market economy in the GDR, and to express the interests of its voters. Reports have appeared in the press on the formation of PDS cells on FRG territory, but it is a question of small groups, in Hamburg for instance, and not an initiative on the scale of the entire Federal Republic. The question of creating a PDS in the FRG will be discussed in the next few weeks. At the same time discussions will be held between various left-wing forces in the FRG. At the recent German Communist Party [DKP] congress a process of rectifying errors and of renewal began. It would be premature to say today how relations between the PDS and the DKP will be structured.

[Correspondents] How do you see your own political future when you leave the post of premier?

[Modrow] This question is, for me, associated with a great many personal conflicts in recent weeks. It is no secret that I intended to end my political activity as head of the transitional government. However, at the First PDS Congress events took such a turn that I decided to submit my candidacy for the elections to the Volkskammer in Neubrandenburg district. I succeeded in winning 28 percent of the vote and getting into parliament. Now a new phase is beginning in my political life as deputy to a freely elected parliament, and at the same time as representative of an opposition party. A new time of learning is beginning for me, and only some of the experience I have acquired will be of use to me. However, I think it will be useful in opposition. Our opposition will be reasonable and constructive.

Retaliatory Ban on Sale of Czechoslovak Currency

PM3003142190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "For the Attention of Citizens Traveling to Czechoslovakia"]

[Text] The USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity reports that Soviet banking institutions have stopped sales of Czechoslovak currency bought with citizens' personal funds, irrespective of the type of trip to Czechoslovakia involved. This measure has been brought about by the Czechoslovak side's refusal to supply the Soviet Union with its national currency before the question of balancing accounts between the countries is settled.

Issues in Withdrawal From Czechoslovakia Aired

LD2903175190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1130 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Excerpts] [N. Agayants, presenter] In accordance with the agreement signed in Moscow on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia, the first units of servicemen from our Central Group of Forces [CGF] arrived in Gorkiy Oblast on 3 March; on 14 March the last wagons carrying the military equipment of the tank division under the command of colonel Tikhomirov left the station of Domasov in Northern Moravia. Thus the process began. By the end of this year the size of the CGF will be reduced by 66 percent. I would ask Captain 2nd

Class Vyacheslav Rusinov, all-union radio military observer, to speak in more detail on this. Go ahead, Vyacheslav Anatoliyevich.

[Rusinov] Yes, this is only the beginning, but there is an enormous amount of work ahead. I would remind you of what until recently was the Central Group of our Forces in the CSSR. There were more than 73,000 servicemen, 1,260 tanks, 2,505 armored personnel carriers, 1,218 artillery pieces with a diameter of over 100 mm, and other types of equipment and weapons. Specialists calculate that more than 1,500 trains will be needed to withdraw this mass from Czechoslovak territory. [passage omitted]

[Agayants] In Czechoslovakia you can often hear from the man in the street that the CGF is living off the Czechoslovak taxpayers. What is your point of view on this?

[Rusinov] I can assure you and all radio listeners that this is not quite so, or more precisely, not at all so. I'll use the figures cited at a meeting with Czechoslovak and foreign journalists by Colonel General Vorobyev, commander of the CGF. So, of 17,600 apartments occupied by our servicemen, 7,700 were built by the Soviet Union, and the others are being rented, I would stress, rented. There are nine square meters of housing space per person, so no one is benefits from anything superfluous there. Our country pays 25 million korunas [Kcs] per annum for the renting of military premises, a further Kcs 19 million for communal services, and Kcs 1.5 million for the housing stock. I would mention in passing that Kcs 2.5 million are spent every year on compensation for various kinds of damage. Regarding the maintenance of the servicemen, the fats, sugar, fish, and some of the bread and meat are supplied for them from the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

Embassy Holds News Conference on Lithuania

AU3003143190 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 28 Mar 90 p 7

[PAP report: "The USSR Embassy"]

[Text] "The aims of the Lithuanian leadership can be deemed dangerous. They can impact negatively on the perestroyka process in the Soviet Union as well as in Lithuania and the republics adjacent to it." That was one of the passages contained in the statement that the USSR Embassy in Warsaw presented at a news conference for Polish and foreign journalists given on 27 March by senior officials of the embassy.

According to embassy representatives, the country's Constitution is still binding on Lithuanian territory. The Lithuanian Parliament did not possess the legal authority to annul the 1940 USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on Lithuania's admission to the Soviet Union or to remove Lithuania from the jurisdiction of the USSR Constitution.

Embassy representatives said: "The Soviet Union supports every nation's right to independence and self-determination. However, such processes should occur in accordance with the Constitution and with respect for the law and the interests of all the peoples of the Soviet Union being preserved. The Lithuanian leadership has failed to appreciate this. The situation in Lithuania is becoming graver. Some inhabitants of the republic are becoming increasingly active in expressing opposition to the decisions made by the Lithuanian Parliament, which they consider have been made without their direct participation."

Aleksandr Oskin, first secretary at the embassy, said: "There is a stormy political debate going on in Lithuania. We are concerned about some of the tendencies present in the debate. We see a danger of an escalation of the situation in Lithuania, whose leadership has embarked on a course that can have unpredictable consequences."

Asked about the growing Soviet military presence in Lithuania, Embassy Counselor M. Senkevich said it was connected with military exercises that had been planned earlier. He said the Lithuanian leadership had met representatives of the military and had been briefed on further exercises of this kind.

Commentary Notes Lithuania as 'Stumbling Block'

PM3003131390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent S. Baygarov report: "Stumbling Block. GDR Press on Events in Lithuania"]

[Text] Berlin, 29 Mar—Lithuania has become the stumbling block not only in the way of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, but also in the building of a common European home, a NEUES DEUTSCHLAND commentary notes.

There is more at stake than the right of 3.7 million people to self-determination, the newspaper writes. It is a question not only of whether the incipient attempt to transform the Soviet Union into a federation of sovereign Soviet republics entitled to secede from the union will succeed or not. Everything positive which has been achieved during the period of perestroyka in the USSR, Europe, and the entire world is now being questioned—such as the hope that a new and better security system will be created for our continent, the dream of peaceful international cooperation instead of confrontation, and the dream that mankind will succeed in off-loading at least some of its oppressive militarist burden.

Local observers see the only way out of the situation in Lithuania through political dialogue and sensible action not only on the part of Moscow and Vilnius, but on the part of Washington and other capitals as well.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Meets With France's Dumas 30 Mar

Talks Begin

LD3003151990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs talks have started between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and his French colleague Roland Dumas. The latter arrived in Moscow today on a one-day working visit to take part in the ceremony opening an exhibition devoted to the bicentenary of the great French Revolution. The Soviet Union and France have good regular contacts both between ministers of foreign affairs as well as at the summit level. Therefore, every opportunity is taken to discuss present-day, acute, complicated problems. During the current working meeting of the heads of the foreign political departments of the two countries, it is no accident that issues related to the prospects for the unification of Germany are being touched upon. It is no secret that as the internal German process grows, the united German state will start to play an increasingly serious role on the continent. Thus, France may lessen its present political influence in the European community. As a TASS correspondent was informed at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, an exchange of opinions is planned at the talks on the role of the four powers in this process, as well as on guarantees of the inviolability of the post-war borders.

Cooperation Discussed

LD3003174690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—It is officially reported here that on 30 March E.A. Shevardnadze, the USSR foreign minister, met with R. Dumas, the French minister of state for foreign affairs, who made a brief visit to Moscow in connection with the opening in the French Embassy of the exhibition "Diplomacy in the Years of the Great French Revolution."

In accordance with the agreement in principle reached between M.S. Gorbachev, the USSR president, and F. Mitterrand, the French president, on maintaining close political exchanges on key international problems, the ministers held a working meeting during which there was an informal discussion of a number of the most important problems relating to current developments in Europe and the world. In this context, attention was first and foremost focused on the potential for further development and deepening of Soviet-French mutual understanding and cooperation as an important factor in the formation of new structures for European relations.

The role of political dialogue between Moscow and Paris, primarily of personal contacts between the heads of the two states, which has grown perceptibly of late, was noted with satisfaction and stress was likewise placed upon the particular urgency in the international situation that is developing for this to be progressively built up.

A substantial place in the conversation was given to examining the current development of the German issue. It was stressed by both sides that the situation that is developing requires the determined acceleration of the CSCE process. From these standpoints work on practical preparations for the pan-European summit in 1990, during which it is necessary and possible jointly to form not only a concept but also the framework of a future pan-European structure of security and cooperation, assumes priority importance.

At the request of R. Dumas, the Soviet minister briefed him on the development of a new phase in the restructuring processes within the USSR, linked to making the methods and rates of the changes being implemented more radical and to increasing the effective operation of the entire system of state power and government.

The state of bilateral links was discussed within the framework of the instructions of the two countries' presidents to the foreign ministers to carry out constant monitoring of the practical implementation of the agreements and accords concluded particularly in light of the results of the first session of the Soviet-French intergovernmental commission on economic, industrial, scientific, and technical cooperation, which ended recently in Moscow. The continued existence of significant difficulties in the development of business links and the necessity of energetic efforts to surmount them were noted. Several other issues of interest to the USSR and France were also touched upon.

E.A. Shevardnadze and R. Dumas took part in the opening ceremony of a documentary and artistic exhibition "Diplomacy in the Years of the Great French Revolution" in the French Embassy in Moscow.

Lithuania, Germany Viewed

AU3003195990 Paris AFP in English 1823 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 30 (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has ruled out the use of force to solve the crisis over Lithuania's declaration of independence, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said here Friday after talks with his Soviet counterpart. Mr. Shevardnadze told journalists, "We are heading toward the rule of law. Each people has the right to self-determination. Unfortunately the mechanism of secession does not exist yet and must be voted by parliament. When this is done, things will be solved normally."

Mr. Dumas said he told his Soviet host that France found the situation in Lithuania "alarming" but he stressed that "one must not add oil to the flames." "Mr. Shevardnadze insisted that the use of force in Lithuania under whatever circumstances was out of the question. He said that a solution was possible through discussion and dialogue," the French foreign minister added.

Mr. Dumas quoted the Soviet minister as saying that reforms under way in the Soviet Union will also bring about changes in the Union's statutes and "lead to self-determination and independence."

In the press conference Mr. Shevardnadze said that the dialogue had to be opened quickly as time was running short.

Mr. Dumas said his talks focussed on the mechanisms of German unification and the on-going "two-plus-four" talks bringing together the two Germanies and the four World War II victors—France, Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union—which share responsibilities for Germany as a whole.

Mr. Shevardnadze reiterated Soviet opposition to rapid unification by way of Article 23 of the West German Constitution. "Reunification is a natural process which must not jeopardize stability in Europe," French sources quoted Mr. Shevardnadze as saying. France favours unification through Article 23 as this would forestall lengthy European Economic Community negotiations on new membership.

Mr. Dumas said President Francois Mitterrand would be in Moscow for talks with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, "possibly in May." [passage omitted]

Dumas Interviewed on Talks with Shevardnadze

LD0104111190 Moscow International Service in French 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] French Foreign Affairs Minister Roland Dumas paid a 24-hour visit to the Soviet Union on 30 March. He had negotiations [as heard] with his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze, on the most pressing problems of European politics. After this the two men attended the opening ceremony of the exhibition: "French Diplomacy and the Revolutions," at the French Embassy, which was organized in Moscow on Roland Dumas' initiative. Speaking at the ceremony, Roland Dumas and Eduard Shevardnadze said that diplomatic relations between the two countries are rooted in ancient history, and that they have deeprooted traditions which are developing successfully today. Roland Dumas noted the increasing level of relations between the USSR and France.

After the opening ceremony of the exhibition our correspondent (Vladimir Kribosheyev) talked to the French foreign minister:

[Begin recording] [(Kribosheyev) in French] Mr. Minister, what are the main aims of your visit to the USSR? Which subjects did you discuss with Mr. Shevardnadze?

[Dumas in French] First of all I came to meet Shevardnadze, taking the advantage of opening this exhibition. In our talks we discussed all current issues, that is, the changes in Europe, the problems of security in Europe, the problems of the reunification of Germany and its different aspects. Shevardnadze also talked to me about the development of things inside the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR]. Naturally, we talked about the situation in Lithuania, which is of concern. Thus we did a very general survey of things.

[(Kribosheyen)] Were your points of view similar?

[Dumas] Of course, and this is not the first time that we have noted the similarity of our views. Of course, there are nuances between us. But things are going well, and it is important for us to see each other. Moreover, we decided to see each other regularly and even more frequently.

[(Kribosheyev)] And what is your assessment of the development of our relations since the summit meeting in Paris last summer?

[Dumas] Well, we also discussed the upcoming meeting between President Gorbachev and President Mitterrand. You know that they decided to meet once a year, and we are planning a highest-level meeting between France and the USSR before the summer. Thank you. [end recording]

Further on Yazov's Visit to France

Lithuania's Status Cited

LD3003183190 Paris Europe Number One in French 1800 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister has very clearly redefined his government's attitude toward Lithuania, which has proclaimed independence, to his French counterpart, Roland Dumas. He told him that each people in the union certainly has the right to self-determination, but the mechanism of secession does not exist yet, that it has to be passed by parliament and only then can things be sorted out normally. In other words Lithuania, seen from Moscow remains a Soviet republic for the time being, whether it likes it or not.

This was said more crudely by the Soviet Defense Minister General Yazov, who is still visiting France. [as heard] He said that as Lithuania is a part of the USSR it is normal for troops to be stationed there.

As for the KGB it has warned the Lithuanian authorities that it will continue to fulfil all its missions, in their country, including the fight against subversive activities.

Reims Base Visited

LD3003213790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1602 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Belfort, 30 March, (TASS)—USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov, who is on an official visit to France, visited the French air force base at Reims on Friday.

The Soviet guests visited the location where the renowned Normandie-Niemen air squadron is stationed and acquainted themselves with the training and living conditions of French military pilots. They were shown Mirage combat aircraft. The delegation watched a demonstration flight by a Mirage 2000 air defense fighter.

The flags of France and the USSR flew alongside each other on Friday above the towers of the famous Belfort Castle, which was regarded during the last century as one of the best fortifications in Europe.

Many famous pages in France's military history are linked with Belfort.

On Friday this town in northeastern France, whose mayor is Jean- Pierre Chevenement, the minister of defense, was visited by USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov. He was received at Belfort town hall, and there was a final conversation between the defense ministers of the two countries.

At a news conference devoted to the results of the Soviet-French talks it was noted that the sides had in particular considered problems relating to disarmament and European security, including in the light of the prospects for the unification of Germany.

If one is in a few words to express the significance of the visit, then its aim was to develop mutual understanding and common approaches to ensuring the peace and security of peoples, said Army General Dmitriy Yazov.

We favor a Europe where peace and democracy prevail, said J.-P. Chevenement. However, in such a Europe there must exist a reliable security system that would make it possible to ensure a balance of forces at the lowest possible level. Its main aim is to guarantee that there will never again be war in Europe. France and the USSR have a particularly important role to play in this respect, stressed the minister.

In accordance with a protocol on the development of Soviet-French interaction in the military sphere, contacts between representatives of the Armed Forces of the USSR and France will be continued. In the near future there will be a visit to the Soviet Union by Maurice Schmitt, chief of the general staff of the French Armed Forces. French warships are to visit Sevastopol. [Moscow TASS in English at 2121 GMT in a similar report notes, "Yazov left for home on Friday."]

Departs 31 Mar

LD3103063690 Moscow TASS in English 0558 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov returned to Moscow this night. He was in France on an official visit at the invitation of the French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0400 GMT on 31 March in a similar report on Yazov's visit to France reports that the USSR defense minister gave an interview to LE FIGARO. Yazov "spoke of the transformation of the Warsaw Pact and of NATO into political alliances. The minister spoke again against the future united Germany's NATO membership."]

Europeans Concerned About United Germany

PM0104183490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Ye. Bovkun dispatch: "Germany Between East and West"]

[Text] Bonn—The FRG and the GDR are not yet united, but Europeans are already having to define their attitudes toward the emergence of a new state formation in the center of the continent.

One way or another, what concerns them is the question of what a united Germany will be like. The quality of relations between the two German states is changing so quickly that both West and East are falling behind in their assessments. The results of the recent elections to the GDR Volkskammer dispelled the illusions of those who thought that their socialist upbringing would prevent that republic's population from moving so resolutely toward rapprochement with the FRG. People want prosperity and democracy as quickly as possible and in full. Whether their hopes will be justified is another matter.

But here is a characteristic feature. While the pace at which social and economic structures are merging is increasing, the progress of consultations on the political status of the future Germany has slowed down.

On what conditions could the four victorious powers of the anti-Hitler coalition lay down their collective responsibility for the whole of Germany? Agreement is hardly likely to be reached on this even during the next meeting of the "Six" ("four plus two"), which is scheduled for the second half of April.

However, the positions of the sides on the question of borders, which is the most important issue for the preservation of stability in Europe, have already emerged quite clearly. "Germany within the 1990 borders"—this formula, people here believe, suits both East and West, including the two German states.

I recently saw a highly prestigious conservative politician trying to persuade an even more conservative audience: In the interests of unity and reunification with the GDR, it is necessary to finally renounce the former German territories in the East. And indeed, what significance do the borders have now, when the reforms in the East mean that they can now be easily crossed: Europe is moving toward integration. We have also been forced to take into account our allies' insistent recommendations, the speaker added.

This meeting took place soon after the federal chancellor had at last unequivocally formulated the federal government's position on the postwar border along the Oder and Niesse, taking into account Poland's demands for guarantees of the inviolability of the said border. This step obviously was not easy for him: For the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union it will probably mean the loss, in the Bundestag elections, of the votes of two or three hundred thousand "exiles," or at least those of them who were still hoping one day to see a Germany in the 1937 borders.

The question of the armed forces of the two German states and their membership of military blocs is more complex. The long-term objective meets with no objections in either East or West: Germany should become a part of the collective security system that is to be built in Europe. As for the transitional period, there are many options. Which is to be preferred?

Neutrality? A few years ago, in FRG parliamentary opposition circles, this was discussed as a possible prerequisite for the unification of Germany. Now, with the exception of the section of the left-wing intelligentsia that has radical inclinations, no one in the FRG is seriously raising this question.

Furthermore, in order to make Germany neutral, it would be necessary first of all to withdraw the U.S. and Soviet troops, whose presence there has a twofold legal basis. It is founded on the right of victors and on membership of the opposing military blocs.

The allies have not yet agreed on the form of their presence in a united Germany. New relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact have not yet become established, either. So until the creation of a system of collective security in Europe, should Germany remain a member of a military alliance? Which one?

The majority of Bonn politicians are convinced that Germany's membership in NATO will ensure twofold security for Europe: Its military potential, integrated into a common system, will be under constant and reliable control, and will at the same time serve to protect the interests of the other members of the community.

"The North Atlantic alliance was invented to keep the Americans in and the Russians out and neutralize the Europeans' fear of Germany," I was told by the well-known German historian M. Stuermer. He believes that the East European countries also have an interest in Germany's continuing to remain under NATO control.

Perhaps. But that does not solve the problem of the presence of Soviet troops on its territory. And what will be the relationship between the FRG and GDR Armed Forces? In a united Germany, where will draftees be sent for their military service?

The security structures of the transitional period are as yet only vaguely outlined. The well-known proposal of FRG Foreign Minister Genscher amounts to not extending NATO's sphere of activity to the GDR. The federal government is inclined to share this view. The Social Democrat governing mayor of West Berlin, Momper, believes that GDR territory should be under international control, for which purpose a four-power agreement should be concluded similar to the one that operates with regard to West Berlin.

Unfortunately neither plan eliminates the contradictions inherent in the dual interim status of a Germany in the process of unification. And the problem will remain unresolved unless the logic of confrontational thinking is abandoned.

Why, for instance, should the Bundeswehr wage war on the GDR National People's Army? Is there any need for NATO and Warsaw Pact headquarters to think up new ways of defending themselves against each other if East and West seek all-around cooperation? As West German General G. Schmueckle, former deputy supreme commander of NATO allied armed forces in Europe, jokingly suggests, they may as well put an advertisement in the newspapers: "Enemy image lost, new one sought!" Social Democrat E. Bahr, an authoritative expert on disarmament problems, is convinced that even an association of states like the present Common Market, to say nothing of the potential for its expansion to the East, is a suitable model for security. Why attack a neighbor who has your capital?

The disappearance of confrontation is an objective factor. Subjective impressions still have to be overcome: We must stop suspecting all Germans of revanchism, and they must stop being afraid that perestroyka in the USSR will grind to a halt and go into reverse. And then it will be possible to come to an agreement.

The FRG leaders' consultations with their allies and the recent speeches by Kohl and Genscher in European capitals give us an idea of the path to a system of all-European security that the federal government envisages. It is proposed to resolve at least four tasks: To complete the economic integration of the European Community; to progress from political cooperation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact to the creation of shared [kooperativnyye] security structures within which the two blocs could be dissolved; to complete the first phase of the Vienna talks by signing two agreements—on conventional arms reduction and military confidence-building measures; and to boost the quality and scale of consultations within the CSCE framework.

If you remember history, the levers controlling German politics were never solely in German hands. And now the fate of a united Germany is indissolubly linked with the fate of the whole of Europe. Perhaps the central part of our continent, where two systems formerly confronted one another, is seeing the birth of a new form of interstate and panhuman relations whose main characteristics will be trust and respect for other people's interests.

United Germany Could Stay in NATO

AU0104155590 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1100 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] In the view of Soviet-Germany expert Dashichev, a united Germany could remain within NATO. Dashichev, who is an adviser to USSR President Gorbachev, stated on Deutschlandfunk at midday today that various forms of a compromise between the West and the USSR are conceivable. Similar to France, Germany could stay outside NATO's military organization, for example. Another possibility would be to reduce the armed forces of the future Germany to an extent that rules out the capability to attack. However, from the point of view of Soviet security interests, the USSR would prefer if no NATO troops were to be stationed on current GDR territory. In the long run, even the presence of Soviet Troops on GDR territory would not make any sense any more, Dashichev stressed. He rejected Soviet Germany expert Falin's proposal to embed Germany unity into a peace treaty. He said that this did not reflect the current situation, and that it was preferable to negotiate a treaty in the framework of the two-plus-four conferences.

Reasons for London Rioting Remain Unknown

PM0104182990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Lyutyy: "Battle of Trafalgar"]

[Excerpts] London, 1 Jan—Never before in this century had anything like this been seen in central parts of London, which turned into the scene of street battles yesterday, albeit without the use of firearms. A black cloud of smoke from burning scaffolding, cars, and rubbish rose above famous Trafalgar Square. Whitehall, The Strand, Regent Street, and Charing Cross Road were strewn with rubble and broken glass. Store windows were smashed. [passage omitted]

As yet it is still difficult to say what caused the fighting. Some demonstrators say that mounted police pushed too hard against participants [in the demonstration against the poll tax]. But the police, and many witnesses too, state that several hundred extremists from anarchist and extreme left-wing organizations, who had come prepared with bottles of inflammable liquid and stones, were just waiting for this to happen.

Today the government condemned the violence. At the same time, seeking to use the incident for political purposes, it states that the extremist groups are under the wing of the Labor Party, which must share part of the responsibility for the carnage. But labor leader Neil Kinnock dissociated himself from the violent elements.

It cannot be said that the clashes happened exclusively because a section of the police or the demonstrators were simply "itching to get at each other." It was more a kind of revolt against Thatcher's policy, a revolt against the rich: As a rule it was luxury limousines that were set on fire and overturned and well-dressed people who were singled out for attack.

The clashes that occurred here have already been christened the second Battle of Trafalgar. The first was won over the Spanish fleet by Admiral Nelson, whose bronze figure looks down from a column in the center of Trafalgar Square. The second will manifestly not bestow any laurels on British democracy.

Latin America & Caribbean

Levchenko Notes Developments in Central America

PY2903195190 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Commentary by Leonid Levchenko]

[Text] Obvious progress has been made in solving the regional conflict in Central America. Venezuelan President Carlos Andres Perez will mediate a meeting in Caracas between Salvadoran rebels and a government delegation. Confidential negotiations between Guatemalan guerrillas and representatives of the National Reconciliation Commission will also be held in the Norwegian capital, Oslo.

Listen what our commentator Leonid Levcheko has to say:

These two meetings have one point in common: Both have been made possible thanks to the initiative and the mediation of the most diverse circles, which are interested in putting out the fire in Central America. The Caracas meeting coincides with the start today of the official visit by Salvadoran President Alfredo Cristiani.

Venezuelan Chief of State Carlos Andres Perez, who welcomed Cristiani, has already held talks with the Salvadoran rebels delegation.

The Venezuelan Chief of State will act as mediator in the dialogue between the Salvadoran Government and the rebels when they sit at the negotiating table. The Oslo meeting was conceived at the initiative of the Lutheran and Catholic churches. This is a big advance if one considers that the first and last direct negotiations between the Guatemalan Government and the guerrillas took place in October 1987 in Spain. They were then suspended and never resumed.

[Passage indistinct] but it has not been easy to advance toward national reconciliation in all the countries involved in the Central American conflict. Before the Esquipulas agreement was signed in 1967 by the Central American presidents, many international forces, which hindered a solution, were involved in the Central American conflict.

The military chiefs of El Salvador and Guatemala also rejected the negotiation process, assuming that they could defeat the rebel movement. In fact, during 10 years of civil war more than 70,000 people have been killed in El Salvador and in nearly 30 years of conflict in Guatemala more than 100,000 have been killed.

It is obvious that the fratricidal war is absurd both in El Salvador and in Guatemala. It is time that, following the example of Nicaragua, other countries contribute to restore peace in the area. This is why the reports coming from Caracas and Oslo have been greeted with great interest. It is clear that a just solution is possible in Central America if only the principles of international law are strictly followed and the countries' sovereignty is respected by not meddling in the internal affairs of other states.

This is the essence of the Soviet view on Central America.

Panama's Expulsion of Cuban Ambassador Viewed

PY2403130890 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Viktor Deruga commentary]

[Text] The Panamanian decision to expel the Cuban ambassador three months after the establishment of the current state of relations between Cuba and Panama and the cautious and moderate tone of the announcement are rather astounding. It is very obvious that the Panamanian authorities want to excuse themselves, as if they wanted to show that the Cuban position forced them to expel the ambassador.

Panamanian Foreign Minister Julio Linares has stressed the fact that Cuba has repeatedly refused to recognize the government of Guillermo Endara and that in several international forums Cuba has claimed that it is a puppet government installed by the United States. He added that Ambassador Lazaro Mora at all times has been respectful and cordial and that this decision does not represent a severance of diplomatic relations with Havana.

The announcement gives the idea that the essential point is not the Cuban stance, which has been clear and invariable since the day of the U.S. invasion of Panama some three months ago. This stance is also shared by several other governments that have not yet officially recognized the Endara government; among them, Mexico and Peru.

There must be another matter that has led the Panamanian authorities to test their precarious international prestige. On the eve of the expulsion, some events took place that allow us to establish some relationships. During his visit to Brazil, Fidel Castro met with several Latin American leaders and stressed the need to place integration of the continent above any ideological differences. This idea has apparently been well received.

Almost immediately afterwards, the U.S. President called for renewed efforts to end the current system of government in Cuba. The Panamanian decision was made precisely when Panama's Second Vice President Guillermo Ford was visiting Washington to negotiate a $500-million loan.

Thus, what is most troubling is not Panama's formal decision to expel the Cuban ambassador, but the fact that it may be part of a new escalation of the anti-Cuban policy unleashed by the United States, which does not hesitate to use all sorts of concealed pressures to obtain support from other governments.

Nicaraguan Protocol Creates 'Favorable Conditions'

LD3103091690 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS on Friday that the signing of a protocol between the Sandinista National Liberation Front and the future Nicaraguan Administration on the order of transferring presidential power creates favourable conditions for the successful completion of the transitional period.

Reports from Nicaragua show that the process of preparations to transfer power in that country is calm. This protocol is the result of a compromise between the two sides.

Along with the Toncontin agreement on disbanding the Contras, the protocol helps strengthen the political stability in the country and promote national reconciliation and concord.

Continuing Contra Activities Cause Concern

PM3003111990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry Representative"

[Text] The Soviet Union is following with great interest the preparations for the next conference of the presidents of the five Central American states, which is to be held soon in the Nicaraguan capital.

This meeting will be held at an extremely crucial time for the fate of the region, when—in connection with the Nicaraguan general election and the forthcoming handover of power in that country to a political grouping that has previously been in opposition—highly favorable prerequisites are appearing for the galvanization of efforts aimed at finally overcoming the Central America crisis that has lasted almost a decade.

Missing this chance would be a serious mistake. The impression is given that this is understood in principle not only by the Sandinistas, who have invariably been advocating a peaceful, political resolution of the conflict and making a substantial contribution to the achievement of that aim, but also by Nicaragua's president-elect V. Chamorro, her supporters, and even many Contra leaders. The agreement reached the other day on the disarmament and demobilization of the Nicaraguan armed opposition formations deployed in Honduras could serve as confirmation of that.

At the same time, the lack of any provision in the agreement on the disarmament of the Contras inside Nicaragua is striking. The report about a massive incursion of Contras into Nicaraguan territory is cause for concern.

The USSR proceeds on the basis of the understanding that a full-scale solution to the Contra problem would remove one of the most important factors of regional tension and that this would allow the Central Americans to tackle more directly the examination of other aspects of a settlement, including the elaboration of measures to normalize the situation in El Salvador.

It seems that the positive experience amassed in Nicaragua of the implementation of measures within the framework of the national reconciliation policy could be extensively utilized, taking account of local features in other countries of the region, El Salvador included. The most valuable aspect of this experience is, on the one hand, that virtually all political parties and organizations in Nicaragua are showing a sense of responsibility for the country's future and understanding of the need to reject strong-arm methods in seeking ways to overcome existing dissension. On the other hand, we cannot fail to note the increasingly positive role played by international control mechanisms and the UN secretary general in the negotiating process and the implementation of the accords which have been reached. We intend to continue giving the necessary assistance to these efforts.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in Venezuala

LD0204091690 Moscow TASS in English 0506 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Text] Caracas April 2 TASS—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Nursultan Nazarbayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Kazakhstan Supreme Soviet, arrived in Venezuela on Sunday for an official visit.

On the delegation are USSR People's Deputies Sergey Lushchikov, Igor Luchenok and Anatoliy Saunin.

Under the programme for the visit, the delegation members are expected to be received by President Carlos Andres Perez and meet Foreign Minister Reinaldo Figueredo, National Congress President David Morales Bello and other congress leaders and government ministers.

CPSU Delegation Departs for Uruguay

PM2703113190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official Ties"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation comprising V.V. Zhuravlev, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute, and Yu.K. Koslov, senior official at the CPSU Central Committee International Department, has left Moscow for Montevideo at the invitation of the Communist Party of Uruguay leadership.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow Reports 2 Apr Supreme Soviet Agenda

LD0104203990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] The third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue work today [2 April]. And although the chambers will sit separately, the deputies are to give a second reading to the same draft law: on stepping up accountability for encroaching upon the national equality of citizens, and forcibly breaching the integrity of USSR territory.

2d Vote Called for Soviet of Union Chairmanship

LD0204085490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0641 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Report from the Kremlin by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Apr (TASS)—The members of the Soviet of the Union, one of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament, were not able today to elect the chairman of this chamber. Neither of the two candidates for this post received sufficient votes to be elected to the post of chairman. Ivan Laptev, chief editor of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, received 125 votes from the Soviet of the Union's members, while 77 voted against; 82 of the chamber's members voted for the other candidate, Konstantin Lubenchenko, the Moscow lawyer, with 109 against.

A decision was adopted to return to the isse of the election of the chairman of the Soviet of the Union at the end of today's sitting or tomorrow.

Lukyanov on Parliament-President Relations

LD0204085990 Moscow TASS in English 0752 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—The institution of a presidential system in the Soviet Union has not changed the place and role of representative bodies—the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. On the contrary, presidential authority will provide an opportunity to implement the decisions of representative bodies better, chairman of Soviet parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov said in an interview published in PRAVDA today.

He believes that the institution of the office of executive president in the Soviet Union introduces changes to the functioning of the top echelons of state power. But the changes mean cooperation, not rivalry, with a clear-cut separation of functions and with the maintenance of counterbalances.

The president is the state's top executive officer uniting representative and executive agencies and personifying the unity of Soviet power in the country, Lukyanov explained.

Therefore the president acts as a person interested in the maintenance of the high prestige of representative bodies.

Since the president acts to a large extent as the guarantor of the quality of laws being adopted as well as of their faithful implementation, presidential authority will help strengthen the powers of and the effectiveness of decisions taken by legislative bodies, Lukyanov believes.

Touching upon relationships between the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the government, Lukyanov said that with such a pattern it becomes a major function of the president to coordinate the activities of these bodies. He believes that despite differing functions these bodies will act "as if in parallel but in the same direction".

As far as the Federation Council and the Presidential Council are concerned, "There is no overlapping of functions here", Lukyanov said. They will work to ensure the closest cooperation between parliament and the president to radicalise reforms in all fields: economic, political and legal, he added.

"The most essential matters now facing the Supreme Soviet are those which are connected primarily with ensuring the stabilisation of society. We stand on the threshold of a multi-party system," he emphasised.

"All currents and ideas converge in the Supreme Soviet and groups of deputies are being formed. Therefore the Supreme Soviet, acting as a body practising political pluralism in actual fact, should try to combine these movements' efforts towards one goal—perestroyka.

"The second task is to ensure a proper internationalist solution to inter-ethnic relations. The third function is to raise the quality of laws and decisions being taken by the Supreme Soviet," Lukyanov said.

It is also essential for the Soviet parliament to master its powers more fully with regard to agencies accountable to it and to monitor ways these agencies enact the laws adopted by it, he believes.

"Several groups of deputies have already been formed in the Soviet parliament and they act very energetically," Lukyanov emphasised.

"The chairman of the Supreme Soviet is required to show both patience, tolerance and will—in short, attention to every deputy and every group. Of course, I cannot be fully impartial, this is impossible. I am a communist and will remain a communist.

"At the same time I proceed from the premise that it was precisely my party that in a pre-congress platform offered a dialogue to all forces that follow the course of perestroyka. I shall do my best to promote the development of such dialogue," Lukyanov said.

Soviet of Union Approves National Equality Law

LD0204094890 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Excerpt] The USSR Supreme Soviet today holds a second reading of the law on increasing responsibility for encroachment on the national equality of citizens and forcible violation of the unity of the country's territory. A separate vote is taken on each article of the new law.

In the first half of the day it was approved by the House of the Union, one of the two houses of parliament.

The same question is on the agenda of the other house, the House of Nationalities. The legal act provides for banning the activity and dissolving associations of citizens, including parties and public organisations, responsible for inciting enmity among nationalities or discrimination. Yuriy Golik, a deputy who presented the draft law, said that responsibility for such action by separate citizens is provided by the present criminal legislation. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Urges Aid for Mothers, Families

PM0104172990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev "Message to the USSR Supreme Soviet From the USSR President" urging adoption of resolution on women and the family]

[Text] I propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet examine and adopt on a priority basis a resolution "On Urgent Measures To Improve the Position of Women, Protect Mothers and Children, and Strengthen the Family."

This is not simply an urgent socioeconomic problem. We are talking about a fundamental question of our society's life and its present and future. No matter how acute the situation may be in other spheres, concern for mothers and children must take precedence over everything. The attention paid to them is one of the most important indicators of the culture and civilization of any society, and primarily a socialist society.

Yet in our society an intolerable situation has developed precisely here. The double workload on women—at the work place and in the home—and the inadequate thought given to the organization of their work, health protection, and social and everyday services complicate women's lives and affect their health, the situation in the family, and the raising of children. The existing system of state benefits and allowances does not ensure the requisite material prosperity for many families. Large families, single mothers, and the inmates of children's homes and other specialized children's units are in a particularly serious situation.

A comprehensive state program for protecting mothers and children and strengthening the family is currently being prepared. I have given instructions that its elaboration be expedited. At the same time I am convinced of the necessity and possibility right now of implementing without delay priority measures to improve the situation of the least affluent families.

I propose a fundamental revision of the size of child benefits, the procedure and conditions for granting them, and the duration of statutory leave and child care leave.

The state has a duty to create for parents favorable conditions making it possible to combine work in social production with the raising of children. Legislative provision should be made for broader opportunities for introducing flexible work schedules and part-time workdays. I also believe that it is unjust when existing legislation restricts the rights in this field of fathers, guardians, and other family members who actually raise a child.

I regard it as essential to revise many norms and rules relating to organizing the work and screening of pregnant women and mothers. I propose that there be an increase in the responsibility borne by soviet and economic leaders for creating real conditions to make women's work easier and take correct account of their psychological, physiological, and age characteristics. There should be a very speedy revision of the list of trades categorized as heavy and dangerous to women and juveniles and of the norms for acceptable workloads, and restrictions—unconditional in the case of women with young children—on using nighttime work by women. Decisions ensuring the protection of the health of women employed in harmful work must be adopted immediately.

I consider it essential to expand foreign currency appropriations for the construction and fitting out of children's and maternity units and for the purchase of imports of essential equipment, medicines, and children's food products.

The implementation of the proposed measures will require substantial additional expenditure. But the funds for these purposes can be found by reducing and optimizing state expenditure. All this will make possible an appreciable improvement in the material well-being of millions of families with young children. A great deal can also be done out of republic, oblast, and enterprise resources. The main thing here is to mold an appropriate understanding of the problems and a committed attitude to solving them.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Law on MVD Internal Troops Published

PM3003200090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

["USSR Law on the Duties and Rights of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops in Protecting Public Order"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Article 1. The Internal Troops form part of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] system and are guided in their activity by USSR laws and other USSR legislative acts, decrees of the USSR president, resolutions of the USSR Council of Ministers, and general military regulations. Leadership of the Internal Troops is exercised by the USSR minister of internal affairs, and immediate management by the commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops.

The Internal Troops are manned by personnel drafted for active military service in accordance with existing legislation. The positions of soldier and sergeant may be manned by USSR citizens on a voluntary basis under contract. The personnel of the USSR MVD Internal Troops are called upon to protect the interests of the Fatherland and defend citizens' lives, personal dignity, and constitutional rights and freedoms against criminal encroachments and other antisocial actions.

Article 2. The Internal Troops, as well as guarding state facilities, special freight, corrective labor colonies, and preventive educational labor colonies and carrying out other tasks entrusted to them, provide assistance to internal affairs organs in the protection of public order.

Article 3. In protecting public order, USSR MVD Internal Troops fulfill the following main duties:

1) carry out patrol and post duty in cities, using the forces of special motorized militia units and, where necessary, operations units;

2) participate in safeguarding public order in the course of mass sociopolitical, sporting, and other events and quarantine measures in the case of epidemics and epizootics, and also at fires and natural disasters;

3) take part in stopping violations of public order if these violations are of a mass nature, constitute a threat to citizens' lives and health, disrupt the work of enterprises, institutions, and organizations, or are intended to damage or destroy state, social, and personal property;

4) adopt measures to stop group insubordination and mass disturbances among convicts in corrective labor institutions.

Internal Troops may be brought in to fulfill the duties indicated in the present article by a decision of the USSR minister of internal affairs. In the cases stipulated in Point 3 of the first part of the present article, the decision is made at the request of the Council of Ministers of the relevant union or autonomous republic either with the consent of the USSR Council of Ministers after mandatory consultation on the matter in question with the Council of Ministers of the relevant union or autonomous republic, or in fulfillment of a decree of the USSR president.

The provision of residential accommodation for billeting, municipal services, motor transport and fuel and lubricants, and additional food for the troop units takes place at the expense of the budgets of the union and autonomous republics in whose territory the troop units are temporarily fulfilling tasks at their request.

Article 4. In order to fulfill their duties in protecting public order, the Internal Troops are provided with the necessary special equipment, combat hardware, and special hardware. Personnel are provided with means of protection and may be armed.

Article 5. With a view to ensuring the fulfillment of the duties entrusted to them in the protection of public order, Internal Troops are granted the following rights:

1) to check citizens' identity documents on suspicion of commission of crimes; to hand over to the militia persons who have committed infringements, with a view to stopping infringements when other means of influence have been exhausted or in order to establish the identity of the offender;

2) to enter the premises of enterprises, institutions, and organizations in pursuit of persons suspected of committing crimes, and also in order to stop infringements that constitute a threat to public order or citizens' safety; to enter residential premises in order actually to stop crimes against citizens' lives or health;

3) in cases of urgency, to use means of communication belonging to enterprises, institutions, and organizations without payment; when in direct pursuit of persons who have committed crimes and in other cases that brook no delay, to use means of transport (with the exception of special and diplomatic vehicles) belonging to enterprises, institutions, and organizations;

4) to cordon off (blockade) areas of a locality or individual buildings and sites;

5) to detain (in the absence of military patrols) servicemen who are maliciously violating public order and hand them over to military commandants or commanders of military units.

Article 6. In the fulfillment of duties in the protection of public order, Internal Troops personnel are entitled to employ handcuffs, rubber nightsticks, tear gas, disorienting sound and light devices, devices for breaking into premises occupied by offenders and forcibly stopping means of transport, water cannon, combat tactics, and guard dogs, and use armored vehicles and other means of transport in the following circumstances:

1) to rebuff attacks on citizens, Internal Troops personnel, or other persons carrying out official duties or their public duty to protect public order and combat crime;

2) to stop mass disturbances and group violations of public order;

3) to rebuff attacks on buildings, premises, facilities, and means of transport belonging to state and social enterprises, institutions, and citizens, and equally to liberate occupied buildings, premises, facilities, and means of transport;

4) to detain an offender offering disobedience or resistance to Internal Troops personnel or other persons carrying out official duties or their public duty to protect public order and combat crime;

5) to release hostages.

The use of the equipment indicated in the first part of the present article, except in the case of the need to rebuff a surprise attack or release hostages, should be preceded by a warning of the intention to use such equipment and the granting of sufficient time to stop the infringement. The type of special equipment and the intensity of its use are determined in the light of the existing situation, the nature of the infringement, and the identity of the offender. When such equipment is used, the possibility of damage to the offender's health must be minimized.

It is prohibited to use special equipment against women with visible signs of pregnancy, persons with unmistakable signs of disability, and children, except in cases of their committing a life-threatening group attack or offering armed resistance.

The list of special equipment and the rules for its use are laid down by the USSR Council of Ministers taking into account the findings of the USSR Ministry of Health.

Article 7. With a view to ensuring the fulfillment of their official duty to protect public order, Internal Troops personnel, in the fulfillment of their duties, are granted the right as an extreme measure in exceptional circumstances to use weapons in order:

1) to protect citizens from attacks threatening their lives and health, and equally to release hostages, if the said protection or release is not possible by other methods or means;

2) to rebuff attacks on sites subject to special protection and other important sites, and also to rebuff armed attacks on sites that are under guard;

3) to rebuff attacks on Internal Troops personnel, militia workers, members of the volunteer people's militia, and other persons fulfilling official duties or their public duty to protect public order and combat crime, when their life is in immediate danger;

4) to detain a person who has committed a crime, offers armed resistance, or is caught in the act of committing a serious crime, or a criminal attempting to escape from custody, or an armed person who refuses to fulfill legitimate requests to surrender his weapon, when it is not possible to suppress the resistance, detain the criminal, or confiscate the weapon by other methods or means.

The use of weapons, except in cases of a surprise attack or the release of hostages, an attack using combat hardware, means of transport, aircraft, or maritime vessels, an escape from custody with weapons or with the help of means of transport, and also an escape from means of transport while in motion, at night, or in conditions of limited visibility, should be preceded by a warning of the intention to use weapons and a warning shot into the air.

Every case of the use of weapons is to be recorded and reported immediately to the prosecutor.

It is prohibited to use weapons against women and juveniles, except in cases of an armed attack by them or their offering armed resistance.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev,
President of the USSR. Moscow, Kremlin, 26 March 1990.

Supreme Soviet Decision on Internal Troops

LD3003115490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Today, we have received the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on putting into force the law on the duties and rights of the internal troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR in maintaining public order, and the text of this document. The law comes into force from the moment of its publication.

Supreme Soviet Establishes Nationalities Committe

LD3003121490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has set up a union-republican state committee of the USSR for the nationalities question to improve state administration in the sphere of national development and interethnic relations.

Public Associations Bill Discussed

LD3003222290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow 30 March (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov writes:

The rapid politicization of the populace is one of the most obvious results of perestroyka in the USSR, and at the same time is a very important condition for its continuation at the new stage. Each week dozens of new public organizations of citizens bound together by some common interests—cultural, economic, national, or political—spring up in the country. Yet paradoxically, there is nobody either in government or in parliament who has any idea of the approximate number of these organizations, still less who has a list of them.

The members of parliament were today able to learn how the preparation of the bill on public associations of citizens is faring. This bill is intended to introduce an element of orderliness to their activity. The authors of the alternative versions of the bill appeared before the parliamentary committee for youth affairs. Of greatest interest to those attending was the actual concept of a public organization, the procedure for registering it, the limitations on its activity, and the procedure for winding it up.

A spokesman for the Ministry of Justice who appeared at the hearings called his version a "synthesis" which incorporated many elements from other drafts, not least "informal" drafts. He emphasized that during its preparation the Justice Ministry document had undergone great changes.

Thus, what is now being proposed is a procedure for setting up public organizations that is based not, as before, on permission, but on registration, and the reasons why registration can be refused are defined more clearly. Whereas the initial draft did not permit "the formation of public organizations whose objective is the violent overthrow of the socialist state-public system that exists in the USSR," the new edition does not insist on the adjective "socialist."

In the opinion of the Justice Ministry spokesman, new organizations should be registered by the organs of justice (not by "interested departments," as originaly proposed), and be wound up only by the ruling of a court. Mutual responsibility is established for infringement of the law, both for organizations which violate their own rules, and for state functionaries who place illegal obstacles in the way of their activity.

All those who spoke during the discussion noted the need for more work to be done on the bill. People's deputy Sergey Stankevich considers that it would make sense to distinguish between public organizations and parties and trade unions, and to define their relationships with public movements and religious organizations. He proposed that the fundamentals of the legislation on this matter should be adopted, and then subsequently supplemented with laws on parties and trade unions.

The work on the bill is to be continued.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appeals to Lithuanians 31 Mar

LD3103170490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Appeal by USSR President Gorbachev to Lithuanian People on 31 March—read by announcer]

[Text] Esteemed citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]!

I am speaking to you at a difficult hour for our country. The 11 March decisions of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet have brought us all to a critical point. The attempts being made by the present Lithuanian leadership to dissolve the republic's links with the Soviet Union overnight, and its chosen tactics of unilateral action and ultimatum, pose a threat to the normal life and security of all people in the republic—Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians—and are causing much alarm in the country. Surely it is not normal that amendments to the constitution which determine the destiny of the republic and its people, and which touch on the interests of the whole country, are decided upon hurriedly, without consultation or discussion, literally in the course of one night?

The USSR Congress of People's Deputies has called on the Supreme Soviet of the republic to renounce political recklessness; and with regard to that appeal to common sense, the Lithuanian leadership has responded with an escalation of irresponsible and illegal decisions. This sets the Lithuanian SSR against the other union republics and against the Soviet Union as a whole. It undermines the historically established ties and cooperation between our peoples.

These actions which are being taken in Lithuania are entirely devoid of logical justification. They are being implemented at the very time when we have really begun, on a democratic basis, to resolve the vital issues of the Soviet Federation.

What is our position? It is one of sincere adherence to the ideas of free and original [samaboytnyy] development for all the peoples of our country. It is one of respect for the legitimate rights to self-determination and sovereignty. This fully applies to the Lithuanian people as well.

Attempts are now being made to convince you that genuine sovereignty within the USSR, without severence from it, is impossible. At the same time, old grievances are being deliberately fanned, and darker aspects of our shared life are being overemphasized. Yes, there are many things in our past that we mutually strike out and reject. That is true not just in relation to the Lithuanian people. But no one can accuse the policy of perestroyka of consciously raising up or purposely humbling any people of our country.

For many years we have shared one home. Does that time not deserve a good word? Have Lithuanian literature and poetry, theater and cinema, music and archictecture, education and sport really faded or become obscured amid the many colors of Soviet culture? Is it not by common toil and with the fraternal help of the other republics that your industry and agriculture have developed? Has not Lithuania itself extended the hand of friendship to other peoples in difficult times?

Was the Constitution of the USSR, which Lithuania followed honestly and exactly for many years as a fully competent republic, not confirmed by the votes of Lithuanian citizens?

The current Lithuanian leaders are trying to convince you that their separatist actions will not have an effect on the economic, scientific, technical, and other links with the remaining republics of the USSR. But this is not so, for all these links can only develop normally and bear fruit in a favorable atmosphere of trust and mutual aid, and by no means in an atmosphere of confrontation and ultimata, of a disrespectful attitude toward each other, and of inter-ethnic dissension.

The pointed disregard of the USSR Constitution, the challenge to Soviet laws, and the failure to fulfill union obligations are giving rise to just indignation throughout the country. The president of the USSR, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Government are receiving numerous letters and telegrams expressing extreme concern and bewilderment in connection with what is going on in Lithuania. People are demanding that the USSR Constitution be defended, that the union be protected from the damage being inflicted on it by the actions of separatists. They propose that effective measures of an economic, political, and administrative nature be used.

In Belorussia and Kaliningrad Oblast, the question is being asked about the return of territories given to Lithuania after it joined the USSR. In general the situation both in the republic itself and around it has become dramatic. And if the voice of reason is not listened to now, the events may have serious consequences for all of us. We must be united in our aspiration not to permit this.

I have appealed to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, proposing the immediate repeal of the illegal acts that have been adopted. This will open up the possibility of discussing all the problems that have arisen on the sole acceptable basis: within the framework of the USSR Constitution. I express the hope that my appeal will meet with the support of the citizens of the Lithuanian SSR. [Signed] Mikhail Gorbachev.

Federation Council Meets, Discusses Lithuania

LD3003184790 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—The Federation Council met for its first session at the Kremlin today. The session, chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev, heard a report by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, about progress in drafting legislative acts to add new substance to the Soviet socialist federation, separate the powers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the constituent republics, and strengthen their sovereignty.

A keen and substantive talk was held on all these issues, federation council members are unanimous that the adoption of laws to harmonise all-union and republican interests, reliably to protect the rights of citizens of any nationality, irrespective of the region in which they live, should be expedited.

The Federation Council comprehensively reviewed the current situation in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and approved measures implemented by the USSR president and the Council of Ministers to fulfil the decisions of the Third Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

The council expressed serious concern that the present Lithuanian leaders stubbornly ignore the demands of the USSR Constitution and the union authorities, are increasingly taking the positions of separatism and national egoism, and act contrary to the vital interests of the Lithuanian people and the entire population of the republic.

Considering this as well as the increasing concern of Soviet people, letters and telegrams coming in to the central authorities, including from Lithuania itself, the Federation Council recommended the Soviet president approach the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet with the demand that it rescind the adopted unlawful acts and thus open an opportunity of discussing the formed situation on the only acceptable basis—within the framework of the USSR Constitution.

Gorbachev Addresses Session

LD3003203790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The first session of the Council of the Federation attached to the USSR president was held in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

[Gorbachev] I would like our first meeting to immediately tackle the most burning issues agitating the country and our peoples today, to discuss them and to exchange views on them. Bearing in mind the USSR Supreme Soviet is hard at work on the drafting of documents and bills, we have decided to include a report by Comrade Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities and member of our Council of the Federation on the agenda of today's first session of the Council of the Federation. He is to report on the state of these documents and the stage their discussion has reached. We have a whole set of these documents. Here in the Council of the Federation we should discuss them in order, on our part, to support the efforts of the Supreme Soviet and the deputies, so that this process more frutifully and effectively proceeds. This is because, in general, we cannot put off the economic reform, for example, or the political reform for a single day. We are now actively working on these and other questions relating to the life of our federation, which are also topical.

[Announcer] The session subsequently heard a report from Comrade Nishanov on the progress of the preparation of draft legislative acts connected with filling the Soviet socialist federation with new content, the demarcation of the powers of the USSR and the union republics and the strengthening of their sovereignty. On all these matters there was a committed and detailed discussion. The general view of members of the Council of the Federation is that it is necessary to accelerate the adoption of laws harmonizing all-union and republican interets and reliably defending the rights of citizens of all nationalities, whatever region of the country they may live in.

The Council of the Federation examined comprehensively the situation that has evolved to date in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and approved the measures being taken by the USSR president and Council of Ministers to fulfill the decisions of the Extraordinary Third USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Serious concern was expressed at the fact that the present Lithuanian leadership is stubbornly ignoring the demands of the USSR Constitution and the union authorities, and is increasingly entrenching itself in a stance of separatism and national egoism and acting in defiance of the fundamental interests of the Lithuanian people and the entire population of the republic. Because of this, and also having regard for the growing alarm of Soviet people and the letters and telegrams that are coming into the central bodies, including from Lithuania itself, the Council of the Federation has recommended that the USSR president demand from the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet that it rescind the unlawful acts it has passed and thus open up the possibility for discussing the situation that has arisen on the only acceptable basis, within the framework of the USSR Constitution.

The following members of the council of the Federation spoke during the discussion of these issues: Comrades Akmatov, Vorotnikov, Gumbaridze, Dementey, Karimov, Nazarbayev, Pallayev, Snegur, and Shevchenko.

Comrade Lukyanov and Ryzhkov took part in the proceedings of the Council of the Federation.

Ligachev Comments on Party, Agriculture

LD0104164690 Mosocw Domestic Service in Russian 1115 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Interview with Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Agrarian Policy, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; by correspondent Andrey Nikiforov; place not given; on 31 March—recorded]

[Text] [Nikiforov] Yegor Kuzmich, how do you see the role of the commission which you head, in supervising the contemporary agrarian sector?

[Ligachev] Well, I would like to remind you that the commissions of the party Central Committee were formed just over a year ago, and now we are all deriving experience, so to speak, from the work of the commissions. I feel that a commission of the party Central Committee, to which members of the Central Committee belong—in particular our commission on agrarian policy—should concern itself, first and foremost, with the implementation of the objectives of the contemporary agrarian policy, which was drawn up at the March plenum of the party's Central Committee.

I think that in its activities the commission should give as much attention as possible to social problems, economic questions, and questions connected with the implementation of the well-known decisions of the party Central Committee on solving the so-called food problem. And this we are trying to do.

Today, for example, at the session of the commission, we examined a whole range of problems. In brief, these were problems connected mainly—and we are happy about this, incidentally—with the life of rural workers, with the improvement of their standard of living and way of life. We are all profoundly convinced that if our society really wants—and this aspiration, this desire is tremendously important—to obtain sufficient quantities of food, of high quality and varied range, it really must ensure that our peasants are well equipped technically and well provided with their social requirements. After all, peasants who do not have the equipment they need, whose life in the villages is difficult, who are obliged to live in uncomfortable apartments without any facilities, without the all-round development of social infrastructure, cannot feed the country, as they say.

I think that, in general, the party's entire activities and policy will ultimately take this into account. It will take account of people's interests and the realization of those interests. In other words, social policy must be central.

Now that we are entering a period in which a multiparty system may develop, I particularly want to stress that I think that man and his interests, his social problems, so to speak, must be central to the activities of every political party, even though this was also characteristic of our party before. But now this will be even more central to its activities. After all, you will agree that the prestige of any party will also depend on the care it takes of people, of working people.

[Nikiforov] Igor Kuzmich, as you have already noted, the struggle for the hearts and minds of all people will surely intensify in the conditions of a multiparty system. If it is to uphold its ideals, the Communist Party will have to renew and purify itself. How do you view this process?

[Ligachev] As you know, the problem of renewal is also the central problem dealt with in the draft platform of the party Central Committee for the 28th congress. I, for instance, consider that we should view the concept of renewal within the party in the following manner. On the one hand—although the questions are linked—there are the problems of broad democracy, self- administration, and more active participation of communists in resolving all questions connected with the party's affairs and activities at all its levels. On the other hand, I consider that, in contemporary (?conditions), the renewal of the party also means the purification of the party and a sorting out of its ranks.

Why? One must bluntly state that, of late, we have quite fundamentally weakened our party. In some of it's sections we have fundamentally eroded and loosened the foundations. I am profoundly convinced of this. Indeed, our society is talking about this. This is constantly being written about by communist, and by nonparty people, too. The time has now come, as we approach the congress to clearly determine every position on the basis of the platform of the CPSU Central Committee, at all levels of the party leadership. In other words we must ask, of every communist, whether he supports the platform of our party or the platform of some other political and ideological trends.

To be frank, we have people who consider that the party should be transformed. But they want to do this from within the party, without leaving it. To a certain extent they want to gain control of its assets, so to speak, and to hive off a certain section of the party. In this way, they will in practice weaken its organizational and political work. In other words, there are people who advocate that our party should be a party of the parliamentary type.

In our platform, however, we have distinctly and clearly said that we advocate a new type of party, a genuinely communist party, a party which conducts organizational and political work in all work collectives, a party which is based on the principle of democratic centralism. But we also stressed that emphasis must be placed on democratic principles. We also favor a party which is based in practice on the territorial production principle, which has party organizations in the army, in the law enforcement bodies, in state security, in state institutions, and in all work collectives.

Therefore, as you see, there are differing approaches to the party. There are differing points of view. So, I tell you honestly and frankly, that since there are people who hold party cards but consider that the party should be different. Such people should leave the ranks of the party and get on with whatever activities they consider necessary.

But what I would particularly like to stress—and here I complete my answer to your question, Andrey Aleksandrovich—is that all this work, work connected with cleansing the party of what I would describe as revisionists, of people who support revisionist, social democratic, nationalistic, and separatist positions, should be carried out strictly in accordance with the party's rules and the Soviet Constitution. There should be absolutely no repressions here, Everything should be decided solely by political means of struggle.

[Nikiforov] Igor Kuzmich, permit me to return once more to the rural theme. Do you think this year could mark a breakthrough in the agricultural industry. After all, people are hoping for so much.

[Ligachev] I want to tell you that we are all very concerned and worried. Basically, I think, all our citizens ultimately regard not just their own personal interests but also, first and foremost, society's interests as being of vital importance. Therefore, we are very concerned by the fact that we have considerable difficulties in the supply of foodstuffs. However, to be frank, I reject the allegations made by some that agriculture has been destroyed, that the country is almost on the point of starvation, so to speak. No. There are difficulties in the supply of foodstuffs. There are quite a few complex problems. In some places, they are even increasing—especially where the supply of meat products to the population is concerned. But, nevertheless, there is confidence that we can ultimately resolve the food question on the basis of the existing system, its improvement and restructuring.

For this we have a definite policy. There is a definite plan of action. Basically, we must restructure productive relations in agriculture. We advocate kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], but not those kolkhozes and sovkhozes which exist at the moment. In our view, these should be, first and foremost, leasehold cooperatives. We also favor the creation of so-called peasant farms in places where it is necesary, where the peasants themselves want this, where it is economically justifiable. We favor the utmost development of our so-called private plots or family plots, as we call them. We have over 36 million of such plots. In a word, we favor agricultural firms, associations—everything.

But at the same time—I want to return to this once again—without new, additonal investment of capital, without new material and technical resources in substantial quantities, we will not be able to provide the people with a sufficient supply of foodstuffs over the next few years. Society must find the means to ensure that, I repeat, the peasants are well equipped technically and well supplied with the things they need. At the same time we must use existing production potential in the best possible manner.

There is no special alarm at the moment about the way this year is developing. But it is not a simple year for us. We must increase agriculture production by seven percent. I tell you bluntly that we have never yet achieved such a figure over a single year. We also have to increase the output of food produce by roughly eight percent. But weather conditions are also developing in such a way that the year may be a successful one.

Finally, in answering this qeustion, I would like to say that it is not simply a question of increasing agricultural production. It is even more important to preserve this agricultural production. Specialists say that we are losing 20 percent of our agricultural production. some even say

30 percent. You can imagine how much more would be available for the table of each of us if this produce could be preserved. Therefore, we are working very actively at the moment on questions connected with the creation of a modern food industry.

Unfortunately, for many decades the belief was that the bigger the harvest you got, the more food there would be. Nothing of the sort happened. The bigger our yields were, the more we lost. Therefore, we have not taken substantial steps to get the defense industry manufacturing equipment for the food industry. I would just like to mention one statistic. In the west, where they have highly efficient storage facilities, specialized transport and a truly up-to-date, computerised food industry, a unit of food costs only a tiny fraction more to produce than a unit of agricultural raw material. We, on the other hand, spend 30 percent more on a a unit of food than on the corresponding agricultural raw material. Therefore, it is particularly important now to reduce losses.

[Nikiforov] Yegor Kuzmich, your interview will be heard on all-union radio on 1 april. Please tell us what part humor plays in your life?

[Ligachev—laughing] I would say to you frankly that without humor it is in general impossible to live, but in our own times—times, let's be blunt, that are crucial, complex, and fierce—humor, I think, is of particular importance. Therefore I should like us, so to speak, not to lose an interest in humor not just on 1 April but at other times, too. I would like to wish our listeners all the best and success, health, and happiness.

Yazov on Lithuania, Abolishing Alliances

LD3003160990 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1505 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Paris, March 30 (TANJUG)—Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov has said that the time is ripe to abolish military alliances in Europe. In a statement to the French daily with the biggest circulation LE FIGARO he assessed that this probably will not be possible at once and that such activities should be political in the beginning stage.

'Military alliances should be replaced by accord and understanding,' Yazov said at the close of his three-day visit to France. In his opinion, the United Nations security system should replace existing ones, all the more so since it has already passed the test in resolving many regional crises.

The Soviet minister repeated Moscow's stand that a unified germany's entry into the NATO pact is not permissible and urged that the '4+2' meeting should jointly formulate 'axes' which would prevent any possible expansionistic attempts by Germany towards any nation in Europe.

Contrary to his earlier statements, General Yazov had a somewhat stronger stand regarding Lithuania. He told LE FIGARO that Lithuania could secede from the Soviet Union only after it pays its debts, but he also indicated the fact that there were one million Russians and Poles in that republic, and that only 40 percent of Lithuanians had gone to the polls. According to his calculations, only 26 percent of the voters were for a break with the Soviet Union, which led him to conclude that the 'people of Lithuania actually do not want a secession.'

Moiseyev on Spring Draft, Service Evasion

PM0104164090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 First Edition p 6

[Interview with Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, by USSR Defense Ministry Press Center for PRAVDA: "The Spring Draft"—date, place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Resolution "On the Discharge From the Ranks of the USSR Armed Forces and Border, Internal, and Railroad Troops Into the Reserve of Servicemen Who Have Served the Stipulated Term of Active Military Service, and on the Routine Draft of Citizens for Active Military Service in April-June 1990" has been published in the press.

This is what Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, said in this connection.

[Moiseyev] The question naturally arises: What prompted the rise in the "rank" of the document on which the draft is based? After all, formerly this was laid down by an order of the defense minister. As you know, a few days ago the USSR Supreme Soviet made relevant amendments to the Law on Universal Military Service. Proposals were submitted on this score by the Defense Ministry, and they were adopted.

In recent years the border, internal, and railroad troops have been taken out of the structure of the USSR Armed Forces. It was, therefore, necessary to bring legal acts into line with the realities. There were also other weighty reasons for increasing the status of the document stipulating the draft dates.

Unfortunately, many problems have arisen here. Many local organs of power, contrary to the requirements of the Law on Universal Military Service, have "cooled off" in their attitude to questions of the draft and the preparation of young people for army service. People have said more and more frequently that this is the military commissariats' job, let them do it. But how can a rayon military commissariat, which has only three to five officers on its staff, cope with such complex tasks? Suffice it to say, for instance, that this spring hundreds of thousands of people are to be discharged, and, of course, the same number drafted. It is not hard to imagine how many organizational questions alone arise here.

"Maneuvers" in the sphere of manpower, including finding jobs for those discharged to the reserve, the organization of medical inspections, transportation—how can all this be handled by the military commissariat alone, or even the USSR Defense Ministry as a whole?

Particular concern is caused by the increasingly frequent instances of attempts to evade military service. Here are some specific figures. In 1985 837 such cases were recorded, in 1988—1,107, and in 1989—6,647. As you can see, the statistics are alarming. This is the result of the influence of many negative factors, including the increase in nationalist actions in a number of regions of the country and the antiarmy campaign conducted by various informal associations.

Unfortunately, here the local authorities often adopt a position of connivance or even approval. In the Baltic region, for instance, out of 259 people who evaded service last year, only two were convicted, and in Transcaucasia—one out of 1,146. Furthermore the organs of power in a number of republics have adopted unconstitutional legislative acts which in effect incite young people to evade service and to desert.

It would be a good idea to ask these legislators—why are they so irresponsible about the future of young people, why do they incite them to crime? Incidentally, such questions can be heard increasingly frequently today in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, for instance.

I am sure that people will also condemn the actions of those rayon and city organs of power in the Baltic republics that have adopted resolutions "releasing" them from participating in the organization of the draft.

But of course, the main point is not organizational questions. The defense of the Fatherland and the strengthening of its defense capability is the cause of the whole people. This means that the draft is also a common cause, and by no means a departmental matter. After all, it directly affects millions of Soviet people. I do not think anyone can remain aloof here, no central or local administrative organ. And the main thing today is to ensure that the higher status of the document regulating the draft helps to achieve a new level of quality throughout the work of organizing it.

Where should we begin here? Perhaps by reviving the tradition of ceremonial sendoffs into the army everywhere. Let every draftee hear kind words of farewell in his family, his labor collective, his educational establishment, from veterans.... After all, this draft is a special one. A nationwide festival is approaching—the 45th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces in the Great Patriotic War.

Ryzhkov Holds Discussion With Oil, Gas Leaders

LD2903195590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Text] The acute problems of the extraction of oil and gas, the urgent needs of the workers of the industry, and prospects for the development of oil and gas were discussed on 28 March at a meeting between Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and leaders of oil and gas producing industrial associations from all regions of the country. Also taking part in the discussion were deputy chairman of the USSR, ministers, leaders of central economic departments, and trade union representatives. During a frank and principled exchange of opinions, a comprehensive analysis was given of the state of affairs concerning oil and gas extraction. A full report of the meeting is published in the press.

Moscow, Kiev To Stage Pro-Lithuania Rallies

LD3003194990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Summary] In solidarity with the people of Lithuania, a rally "For Your and Our Freedom" will be held in Moscow at mid-day tomorrow.

The oragnizers of the rally are, "Memorial", Association of Social Democrats, Interregional Association of Democratic Organizations, Electors' Club of the Academy of Sciences, the Russian People's Front, and representatives of Rukh, and the Ukrainian People's Front.

A rally devoted to the restoration of the statehood of Lithuania will be held in Kiev at 1400 tomorrow. Deputies of the Lithuanian parliament have also been invited to take part in the rally.

Liberal Democratic Party Congress Opens 31 Mar

LD3103071990 Moscow TASS in English 0659 GMT 31 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Kirill Duibrov]

[Text] Moscow, March 31 TASS—The Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (LDPSU) is one of the first new political organisations which will evidently be registered soon due to changes in the USSR Constitution.

The first all-union congress of the LDP formed last December will open in Moscow today.

The party's main tasks are set out in its programme. These are supremacy of the law over all other principles, a multiparty system, a multistructural character of the economy, presidential rule and deideologisation of all state structures.

According to LDP Chairman Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, 42, a Moscow lawyer, deideologisation is the main provision among others.

"I do not share either the principles of Marxism-Leninism or any other theories," he told TASS. "Theories turn into tenets with time, preventing society from making progress. Therefore, our party can implement its other tasks only if state institutions are fully deideologised."

The LDP leader believes that common sense is the only theory by which his organisation abides.

He claims that the party now has about 3,000 members. "We do not seek to establish a big party, but we are sure that we shall become a one million party in a year or two," Zhirinovskiy said.

He noted that the LDP has its branches in many cities of the Russian Federation, the Baltic republics and Transcaucasia. The party stakes on the Russian-speaking population in its political work.

The LDP is for the preservation of the Soviet Union but thinks it necessary to change relations between the republics. In the opinion of Zhirinovskiy, Russia's relations with the Baltic Republics and Transcaucasia should be built on the principles of the confederation and with Central Asia—on the principles of a federation.

Despite the fact that the observance of legality is an underlying task of the party, its constituent congress was held before the USSR Constitution was changed, which is a glaring violation of legislation operating at that time.

Provisions about the LDP membership are also ambiguous: anybody can now join it, even a member of another party, including the Soviet Communist Party.

Party Chairman Interviewed

LD3103194790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Interview with Vladimir Volfovich Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party, by correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich; place and date not given—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Shakhnovich] Vladimir Volfovich, there are five principles at the basis of the position of your program: a multiparty system, presidential power, a multistructured economy, and furthermore, de-ideologization of all public institutions, and a law-governed state. The CPSU has already achieved many of these principles, or is at least in the process of achieving others.

[Zhirinovskiy] Indeed, but in the first place, the fifth principle has not been proclaimed by the ruling political structure, yet it is of the most major determining political importance, because a law-governed state will be impossible unless de-ideologization is carried out. The main thing is, though, that all these five principles were put forward by our party two years ago. In principle, many parties have one and the same goal: No party would say that it is against the well-being of the people, against prosperity. The question is, by what means is this to be achieved? It is here that we differ, including on principles which are allegedly alike, because we are nevertheless in favor of electing the president by a nationwide vote. We advocate that the law on land should be more radical—one can buy and sell—but the law which has been adopted does, nevertheless, infringe rights; the peasant will not become an owner.

[Shakhnovich] What about tactics and methods?

[Zhirinovskiy] We want to act only within the law.

[Shakhnovich] And what, in your view, are the results of the congress?

[Zhirinovskiy] The program has been approved. As yet we have no detailed, specific figures in this program, we only set forth our position on the main issues. We approved our rules. We in effect adopted all the documents, elected the leading bodies, and we thereby officially, at a broad all-union level, declared that such a party exists. And we expect that the registration of the party will take place in the coming week, we shall obtain premises, a headquarters. Our tactics of action will be the calmest possible: We do not at all intend to call people to go on strike or to attend a large number of meetings and demonstrations. Our party is prepared to carry out our work in the same way as today. We have a newspaper, RECH, which is published: We propose that it should at first be a monthly newspaper, and later a weekly, and in the long-term possible even a daily. And we are ready to take part in discussions and disputes. We are in favor of working within the law, and of not evoking any political tension in society, so to speak. We are in favour of all citizens dividing up into different parties: There, within party activity, so to speak, they can engage in self-expression, in working out positions, and through this sort of action they will of course exert pressure upon the country's organs of government. But not by means of huge numbers of people coming together at meetings, which sometimes arouses fear among the population.

[Shakhnovich] What specific features of our country will be reflected in your party's program?

[Zhirinovskiy] We are ready to accept under our banner, so to speak, representatives of all strata of society, especially in so far as we reject the class theory and such ideological postulates, so we have everything. We have the most prospects, precisely because our population has wearied of leftwing phraseology. If one goes to the extreme right wing, people are afraid of them, and quite rightly, too. This is why I think that the majority of the population will take its bearing from a party such as our Liberal Democratic Party. We do not say what we shall give: we simply say what we sort of people we are. If we please the electorate as we are, then go ahead and vote for us. But we are not going to promise to build anything or give anything straightaway. We promise nothing.

We are often asked: Have you any famous names with you? That is a mistake, again. Again people want a name for the party to drag along behind, whilst the party will act in the way that individual acts. That is the disease of the leader [Vozhd] again. And that is something that our party does not have: Our party will never have a leader.

'Marxist Platform' Criticizes CPSU Leadership

LD3103140190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0645 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 31 March (TASS)—A new draft program document of the CPSU containing criticism of the current party leadership is published today in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, the capital's municipal newspaper.

This document, called by its authors "A Marxist Platform in the CPSU," represents an alternative to the official draft platform with which the CPSU Central Committee is moving toward the 28th party congress (planned for this summer) and is another alternative version of the party guidelines. The best known of those already published is the "Democratic Platform" which has been adopted by several dozen party clubs.

"A Marxist Platform in the CPSU" was prepared by the Federation of Marxist Party Clubs. Nothing is known about the size of this association which declares that it is consolidating the social forces "adhering to socialist choice."

The federation criticizes the present CPSU leadership and the Soviet state for the fact that it "seeks at the present time to preserve at all costs the formal unity of the party, society... to ensure the implementation of a policy of reforms by maneuvering between all social strata and political movements." According to the authors of the platform, this leads to a situation in which the position of the party leadership "is constantly evolving from a conservative-bureaucratic to a social-democratic one."

The program put forward by the Federation of Marxist Clubs starts out from the view that "only a movement that is Marxist in its ideology and geared to socialist choice corresponds to the fundamental interests" of the USSR. It proposes measures which, in the authors' opinion, "eliminate the existing model of the CPSU as a party of 'barrack-room socialism,' but do not eliminate the Communist Party itself."

Among these measures is the freeing of the CPSU from the functions of directly running the economy; making more precise the CPSU's ideological base, and ideological demarcation; and the democratization of intra party relations.

PRAVDA Readers Dispute Democratic Platform

PM3003171090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Feature comprising four letters from readers as part of a page devoted to "Discussion Pamphlet No. 19: The Party and Perestroyka—Toward the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] **Invitation to a Debate**

I read a notice in Pushkin Square inviting people to visit a discussion club. The address was given: the small hall of Sevastopolskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee. The CPSU raykom [rayon committee] is in the same building.

Naturally, I went along to find out. About 100 people gathered in the hall. Before the start of the debate, pamphlets were on sale. I wanted to buy one, but the price was exorbitant. Two rubles for a pamphlet—on my budget, that is rather expensive.

The introductory report was delivered by a certain Kobrin. Speakers then mounted the platform. They even included one from Gorkiy. He stated that he is only here by chance, but he likes the way of thinking, and will campaign for the creation of such a party.

What was the way of thinking in that hall? I will tell you straight: There was no question of any debate. Everyone was saying the same thing. They all spoke against the CPSU. It is like this, and like that. And so a new party should be formed—on the Democratic Platform.

I listened carefully to a long report by V. Lysenko, member of the Democratic Platform coordinating council. He was indignant with the CPSU Central Committee Plenum for not giving him the floor. He informed us that there is a split in the party. There is no unity, even in the Politburo. He named the Politburo members: Who is "for," who is "against." He called on us to campaign among communists for the creation of a democratic party. He proposed that this work should be done cautiously, so as not to frighten people off. He said that it is necessary to win over everyone who is dissatisfied with CPSU policy. He advised communists not to pay party membership dues for three months, and to donate the money for the creation of the new party. Then he handed out specimen questionnaires for campaigning. After reading the questionnaire, people are supposed to sign their names. And they are thus counted as belonging to the new party.

I could not restrain myself from asking Lysenko: "And who heads your party?" He immediately named well-known USSR people's deputies from the Interregional Group.

To be frank, I am not sorry I went to the club session. I finally grasped who is who. They are conspirators, not participants in a debate. Both their words and their deeds are rather unscrupulous. Another thing is surprising. All this took place in the CPSU raykom building. Do the raykom leaders know what is happening within their walls?

[Signed] M. Fedorov,

CPSU member since 1946,

Moscow.

The emergence of party clubs and associations is a natural phenomenon. The birth of the Democratic Platform alternative document is an attempt to find a way out of the crisis. Both documents offer a profound, comprehensive analysis of the processes taking place in the party and society. But they are not without a number of shortcomings—vagueness and abstractness of expression.

Final conclusions will be possible after a detailed analysis of the partywide debate. But I am convinced that a consensus between the two platforms is possible and necessary. The broad debate in PRAVDA and in the primary party organizations will enable us to formulate a single platform reflecting the interests of all democratic movements within the party.

[Signed] A. Moskvitin,
Secretary of the Berdskiy Electrical Engineering Plant party committee.

The People Will See Through It

So the "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU" proposes to rob the party of its vanguard role, rob it of its scientific philosophy—Marxist-Leninist teaching, abolish party committees in the army, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, state institutions.... What kind of a party do the Democratic Platform's ideologists want to create?

Basically this is an attempt to restructure socialism as capitalism under cover of the slogans of radical perestroyka. Therefore, in my view, the Democratic Platform should be separated from the party. Once it officially announces its own party with its own program, the people will soon see through it to its destructive, demagogic, antisocialist essence.

It seems to me that some people want to exploit democracy and perestroyka in their own interests. They are not in the least concerned about the consequences. Because they know that once again, all the troubles will fall onto the shoulders of ordinary people.

[Signed] N. Sergeyev,
Ufa.

Like Bystanders

Let us begin by expressing our general opinion of the Democratic Platform: It misrepresents the history of the CPSU and pursues the goal of discrediting the party, splitting it, destroying it, and thereby depriving it of its vanguard role in society.

The authors of the platform, when they speak about the crisis in the party and state that "the starting point is the crisis of communist ideology and first and foremost the modification of that ideology by which the CPSU was guided for many decades," are talking about it as if they were bystanders who do not regard themselves as party members with responsibility for the shortcomings that exist. Yet only recently they were contributing to the best of their abilities, as the saying goes, to the development of that ideology.

It is claimed that well-known political scientists took part in drawing up the Democratic Platform and that it was discussed several times at scientific institutes. But that kind of justification is what prompts doubts. When were these "political scientists" being honest: before, or now?

Was it not these scientists who once wrote: "...The 24th CPSU Congress drew a new conclusion in 1971—on the building of a developed socialist society in the USSR.... The doctrine of developed socialism and the criteria for assessing the maturity of the socialist phase were developed in the USSR in the writings of L.I. Brezhnev, ...in the works of other CPSU leaders, and in the works of leading scholars." Or: "...The Soviet people have built a developed socialist society. This is the level from which new stages of maturity, leading to communism, are already within view." Nowadays, these scholars do not describe our socialism as anything other than "barracks" or "totalitarian." Incidentally, these epithets are used in the Democratic Platform.

In our view the reason for the sharp decline in the Communist Party's influence is that its ideological centers—the Academy of Social Sciences, the higher party schools, the relevant institutes, and the mass media—stopped propagandizing Marxist-Leninist science as soon as perestroyka began, and launched into unsubstantiated criticism of it. Higher educational establishments drastically reduced their interest in social disciplines, and the study of some of these disciplines stopped entirely.

Let us look back at our history. How can you underestimate the CPSU's role in ensuring our state's independence, transforming an agrarian country into a leading, economically developed country, and carrying out the cultural revolution? Remember how much the party did to strengthen the USSR's defense capability and rout the fascist German aggressors, to liberate the peoples of Eastern Europe, and to restore the war-ravaged national economy. In the most difficult time, in the first six months of the war, within the Armed Forces four times as many people joined the party as in the equivalent period before the war. Nobody was forcing the soldiers to join. Does this not amount to the people's recognition of the CPSU's prestige?

This is the party that the authors of the Democratic Platform are now calling the "order of sword-bearers" and calling on to recognize the enormous responsibility "which the CPSU bears for the results and consequences of the totalitarian regime in our country"!

And what is the meaning of the proposal by the authors of this platform to review "dogmatic ideas on the historical mission of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat," and so forth, if it is not a sign of the desire to undermine the vanguard role of the working class in the party and thereby reduce the CPSU's influence among working people and sow discord between the working class and the intelligentsia?

The Democratic Platform focuses all its attention on the power struggle in the CPSU and the state; the authors of the platform are not interested in resolving questions of improving the people's life.

We do not believe that communists who denigrate the CPSU joined it from conviction, rather than for the sake of their careers. Unfortunately many of them, under cover of party spirit, managed to secure high positions and occupy leading posts. Having taken everything from the party, now, when times are tough, they betray it.

We appeal here to those who joined the party not for career reasons, but following the prompting of their hearts. Many of our party comrades gave their lives to defend our Soviet Motherland. How can we allow the title of communists to be further trampled into the mud? Can we not close ranks in the struggle against those who are trying to cut off the party from the people and the people from the army?

It is time we gave a principled assessment of that kind of CPSU member, in our own primary party organizations.

[Signed] D. Nikishin, V. Bagrov, I. Korotkov (13 signatures in all)—members of the Military Science Society at the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army and veterans of the war and the Armed Forces.

Zolotov Appointed to Culture Post

LD2803213190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 28 Mar 90

[Summary] Andrey Andreyevich Zolotov, a journalist and critic, has been appointed USSR deputy minister of culture.

Zorin Comments on USSR Superpower Status

LD0104115290 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Weekly commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] No so long ago I came across statements about the Soviet Union made by Robert Legvold, the director of the Harriman Institute for the Soviet Union Studies affiliated to Colombia University. These statements have aroused my concern because one can find similar statements in the speeches of those who determine United States policy.

The pieces put forward by Robert Legvold state that the Soviet Union is losing its status of a superpower and the Soviet leadership, therefore, should pursue its foreign policy in keeping with its new, more modest status. Moreover, the head of the Harriman Institute reports that the American Administration acts proceeding from the assumption that the Soviet Union already pursues its policy from a position of weakness, and this allows the United Stats to strike unilateral advantageous deals.

It's true, Robert Legvold himself disagrees with the administration's line, regarding it as short-sighted, and he undoubtedly should be given credit for that, but what surprises me is the fact that Robert Legvold and some other American politicians share in the theory that owing to its economic difficulties, the Soviet Union has lost the status of a superpower.

This assessment is wrong and even dangerous, I'd say. There were quite a few periods in the history of Russia when attempts were made abroad to put Russia under the category of second rate states. As an expert on Soviet Union affairs, Robert Legvold should know this better than others. For example, in 1917 some in the West hurried to announce Russia's disintegration and its disappearance as a great power from the map of the world; in 1941 when the German invaders were at the approaches to Moscow, some in the West hurried to write the Soviet Union off the accounts, but in these and other cases, long-term factors were working that eventually determined Russia's place in the world.

But if we look at the current period of history, America and other countries began ranking the Soviet Union as a superpower, not because the Soviet economy caught up with the American economy—this has never been the case. That happened because the Soviet Union reached a nuclear parity with the United States. And this initial factor remains unchanged. The nuclear balance will be kept until nuclear weapons are totally destroyed everywhere, and we'd like, of course, to see this balance preserved at the lowest possible level.

Incidentally, in his report on national security strategy, sent to Congress last week, President Bush gives, to my mind, a rather realistic analysis of the situation. He points out that relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are a strategic priority because the Soviet Union is another military superpower. As you see, in contrast to some American Sovietologists, the President seems to accept the situation as it is.

Yeltsin Undermining of Gorbachev Noted

90UN1213A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 1

[Article by Anatoliy Yurkov: "With the Right of the Deciding Vote"]

[Text] Let us congratulate Gorbachev: He became the first president of the USSR.

Let us congratulate ourselves: We elected Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev our first president, a person and a communist who became the initiator of perestroyka and radical transformations, and who also led the country to the presidential form of government.

Let us also congratulate the 1,329 people's deputies who gave their vote to Gorbachev the president, and who actually performed an act of historic significance, which we have yet to realize properly.

I would also congratulate those who voted against—for their courage and for the lesson in democracy which they have taught all of us. But could we have supposed back in the first elections that someone would dare stand in front of the head of state and eye-to-eye, for the whole country to see, subject him to severe criticism. We pronounced such a possibility theoretically a long time ago, but it was only on the evening of 15 March that the country saw and heard this. It understood how all of us, including his now open political opponents, are obligated to Gorbachev. Specifically to him, so that they would not talk there about the wisdom of the collective leadership. For when there was nowhere else to withdraw to, we, nonetheless, decided to trust one person—the president. It is more dependable that way.

Of course, it would even be better if I myself (just as each one of us) had voted for the president, and if my civic voice had brought victory to Mikhail Sergeyevich in the elections. Then, as the saying goes, we would be in complete accord; I do not know about him, but I would feel somewhat responsible for every step of his. And for mine also. It is probable that such a feeling is natural in a person, and that it makes us stronger when it is taken into account. And the other way around.

In fact, what consolation is there for me that I participated in the election of the president through my deputy to the congress. By an irony of fate, "my" deputy is B. Yeltsin, and I know with what consistency he is attempting to destroy Gorbachev's prestige, and how he predicted and is predicting failure and infamy for him and his cause. Indeed, you cannot envy the situation into which Boris Nikolayevich has gotten himself. Vote "against"—the voters will not understand, and this, as is known, is fraught.... Vote "for," and you will go against your own claims and calculations. Indeed, "your own" also will not understand. But a choice has to be made.

I made my choice a long time ago. And someone must give my vote for Gorbachev! But Boris Nikolayevich, in my opinion, was not at the congress, and he did not vote. Perhaps for Yeltsin the politician this will be insignificant. But I do not want to reconcile myself to the fact that my vote was "lost," which I absolutely wanted to cast for Gorbachev. Thereby to participate personally in this historic process. Therefore, I side with those who are for a constitutional norm: Elect the president of the USSR through a popular and direct vote. Now, that is the way it will be.

But Gorbachev had to be elected president the way that he was elected. Time is pressing. I think that even so time has been lost. Look at how many laws were not passed in just this year. Indeed, and how many that are critically needed—but they are not functioning: I have firsthand information, acquired at plants from workers and managers, with whom this problem was discussed. The command-administrative machine proved to be more effective than many of the new laws: The actions of some of the perestroyka laws are not going any farther than the offices.... The chain reaction of nationalism has proven to be stronger than long-time friendships: Animosity has overwhelmed reason.... Yesterday's party comrades have parted along different sides of the barricades....

Time is pressing, and we have all become impatient. Yesterday, we called the president to power. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev agreed. Perhaps this moment will become doubly historical: Will it not mark the countdown for our path to harmony? I want to think that this will happen. You see, only it can deliver us from misfortune.

Opposition to Reforms Assessed

PM2103183290 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 10, 6-12 Mar 90 pp 8-11

[German Diligenskiy article: "The Reformers and Conservatives: Who Will Tip the Scales?"]

[Text] In most East European countries revolutionary reform began with a mass grass roots movement of protest against an authoritarian government. The overthrow of these government unified the movements and gave them strength. In this country, however, perestroyka was inaugurated by the authorities, or more specifically, by the highest echelons of the party leadership, yet, the same authorities have also slowed perestroyka down. This causes ambiguity, contradiction and inconsistency in the policy of reform and in public opinion. This ambiguity manifests itself in opinion polls which show that people see the chief obstacle to change in the absence of any clear perspective and a lack of consistent political guidance of the process of renewal.

The mythology of perestroyka

Paradoxically, being actively involved in the political life of our country today means support for the political leadership and opposition to the bureaucracy controlled by this leadership. In these conditions, the progress of perestroyka heavily depends on a further polarization of forces within the Communist party, within the government and within society itself. It depends on how clear an answer one can get to the question of "Who is Who?" And it is not without reason that this question is most often shunned by those who are not interested in the profound changes of our society, but instead cling to the obsolete dogmas of the past. For example, one of the speakers at the recent plenum of the Communist Party surprised everyone by claiming that among us there are no radicals and conservatives, but only those who honestly favour perestroyka and the mysterious "anti-socialist forces" which, according to the speaker, act hand in glove with the nationalists and separatists. His motive is obvious - to throw some mud at the opponents of authoritarian rule who demand radical changes, by confusing them with hooligans and fascists (politely referred to as extremists).

The actual progress of perestroyka does not in the least resemble this mythology. The mounting mass movement in support of fundamental change and greater democracy can already show for itself a record of sweeping miners' strikes and "regional revolutions" which ousted from power many local party leaders, as well as a record of intense struggle within the party itself for a major reorganization. Yet with time, the weaknesses of this movement are also coming to the fore. One of these - perhaps the most painful - is the absence of an all-union organization. Instead we have a variety of splintered and disconnected groupings and trends which, given the aggravated interethnic strife in many republics, undermine unity of action. Very often, true or illusory national interests get the better of perestroyka's goals. As a result, most of the debate about and struggle for the success of the policy of change is unfolding in the Russian Federation and in parts of the Ukraine. Even here, the ranks of supporters of perestroyka are sometimes disunited as attempts are often made to reshape the movement on national or ethnic grounds or transfer it onto the path of conservative popularism. The grass roots democratic movement is in fact deprived of a centralized leading force. The radical faction in parliament is unable to assume this function because of its own diversity and the absence of well-considered tactics.

Much of the prestige of radical reformers rode on the authority of the late Dr Andrey Sakharov. He blessed their political goals and policies, lending them lofty ethical and social meaning. Only a figure of his calibre could dispense with the consideration of tactics for the sake of the major strategic objectives of renewal. Without Sakharov the radicals cannot afford this. They must reckon with the simple truth that politics is the art of the possible.

Conservatism and its base

The contradictions and weaknesses of the radicals would not call for our scrupulous attention if they did not help to revive conservative trends. Conservatives from the state and party apparatus have gradually got over the initial shock of last year's election results and begun to consolidate their ranks. From passive resistance and purely emotional resentment at the advent of greater openness and pluralism, they have now turned to active political struggle. In doing so, they have overpowered the old habit of awed obedience to their superiors and compliance (however formal) with instructions issued "from above." The speeches of party officials at plenary sessions and conferences of the Central Committee and regional party forums, and the notorious meeting in Leningrad, all testify to the formation of staunch opposition to the central authorities and the General Secretary.

The conservatives obviously seek to make up for one of their major weaknesses exposed during last spring's elections—a lack of a consolidated social base. They are now trying to capitalize on growing public discontent with the economic crisis, the degradating consmer market, the wear and tear of everyday life and worsening interethnic troubles. Much attention is focused on the drive to create the image of "an internal enemy" which incorporates—ridiculously—the dealers of the "shadow economy" and cooperatives, the country's progressive economists, the mass media, new nonofficial organizations and well-known political figures. All of these bogeymen allegedly nurse the idea of a return to capitalism, and plan to sell the country's territory to foreigners. All of this is accompanied by innuendo about possible linkage between these "destabilizing forces" and the country's political leadership.

A new bloc

The secessionist movement in the Soviet republics, which undermines the interests of the Russian part of their populations, permits conservatives to use the "nationalist syndrome" in public consciousness for their own purposes. For instance, they accuse the democrats of conniving to foment "Russophobia." It is on this basis that the seemingly improbable union of advocates of Stalin-type socialism and of Russian monarchism is formed. However, at closer range, the criticism levelled by the White Guard against the October Socialist Revolution and the kind of "Marxism-Leninism" promoted by Stalin and Zhdanov, do not differ from each other that much. They are basically versions of one political idea - "a social order" based on great-power nationalist values and iron hard despotic rule. It is no coincidence that in modern new-Stalinism "the class approach" is so inextricably tied to chauvinism and anti-semitism.

It is only natural that at the February party plenum not only domestic but foreign policies based on the new political thinking came under harsh criticism. Rightwingers are openly annoyed by the facts that the Soviet Union no longer acts in a high-handed fashion in Eastern Europe and that it established friendly relations with the new Polish government. They desperately want to put "the blame" for the revolutions in Eastern Europe on the leadership and return to "the Brezhnev doctrine." Thus, we are not dealing with a difference in tactics, but with obvious attempts to restore imperial ideology and policy and to end Gorbachev's new course in foreign policy.

How successful have the attempts to popularize conservatism been? In answer to this question let us look at the scope of activities of united fronts of the working people. The movement itself can be viewed as a reflection of the aspirations and hopes of that part of the population (mainly, the working class) who demand implementation of the economic and social reform (better living standards and higher prestige for the job of a worker) but have a very vague idea of the economic possibilities of the reform. Recent sociological studies show that many blue- and white-collar workers support greater economic independence for territories and state enterprises, land leasing and private farms, but not the cooperatives or small private businesses. In the fall of 1989, only one out of five respondents (including only 13 per cent of the workers) backed the policy of inviting foreign investments in the Soviet economy. In other words, the majority of the population is prepared to support economic reform only if it maintains the link between the worker and the state. People want to make this link more flexible and to acquire a degree of "independence," (hence they back the ideas of self-regulation, self-financing and leasing) but they are clearly afraid to breaking this link. For them, state regulation of the economy guarantees their social and economic security.

The workers are there, but what about the intellectuals?

It would be wrong to view the united fronts of the working people simply as a conservative force. They are a manifestation of the people's growing desire to control the economic and political process by themselves. This democratic trend, the search for a way to influence decision making in times of crisis, drives People's Deputy V. Yarin to speak up: "The aim of the united fronts of the working people is not to wage wars but to let the workers get involved in political activities, and that is something they have been deprived of."

History tells us that the initial stage in the workers' movement, taken up by campaigning for people's economic and civil rights (from higher wages to universal suffrage), is sooner or later replaced by the struggle for power. At first the group interests of the working class are the chief driving force. However, eventually the focus shifts as the workers are increasingly able to act in the interests of the whole of society, mastering and using to their benefit the laws of economics. In this country, the transition from the initial to the second stage took the form of a revolution through which the working people came to power. But then the process was cut short as the bureaucratic apparatus, acting independently from the working people, monopolized power in its hands. Thus the second stage was never completed and the workers' movement, for a long time, disappeared from the political scene. This long break is now telling on the revived popular movement of the perestroyka period: it is still markedly archaic in its forms. A sense of deprivation and blind protest is sometimes much more prominent than a sense of social responsibility, and the "isolated" social mentality, which pits workers against other social strata, predominates over the realization of common interests. Yet at the same time, the crisis of the administrative-command system urges workers to take a constructive stance on issues of economic management. And among the better organized and more educated ranks, this awareness is obviously growing.

An isolated workers' movement is unable to develop and implement a comprehensive programme of reform. It needs professional counselling and help from intellectuals. The Soviet working class has found itself in a rather grave situation where the radical intelligentsia is not particularly mindful of the interests and aspirations of the working people. The most ardent advocates of a market economy seem to ignore its potentially negative effect on workers, and ideological battles and faction feuds appear to preoccupy some radicals much more than the immediate needs of ordinary people. A gaping hope in the banner of the new ideology is being eagerly patched up by the conservative wing of the intelligentsia.

What the UFWP [United Front of Working People] holds out for us

The more dynamic of the conservatives know full well what mottos will never go down with the Soviet people. They know that under present conditions calls for a return to Stalin or Brezhnev-type "socialism" (in the spirit of the manifesto compiled by Nina Andreyeva) will not be heeded. Reforming conservatism therefore seeks to use the weapon of criticism for its own purposes by hitting out hard against "corrupt bureaucracy" and demanding an end to the unlawful privileges of the party apparatus. In the political platform of the neoconcervatives, populist slogans cover up the essential part of their ideology which distorts the true goals and perspectives of perestroyka. The hard-liners are flat against the introduction of a market economy and new forms of representative and pluralistic democracy.

In trying to channel popular dissatisfaction against the idea of a market economy, they blame it for all the recent economic failures. They do not even bother to substantiate their claim; and have good reason not to, because, as yet, there is no market economy to speak of. The government programme of economic reform approved by the Congress of People's Deputies has in effect put off any major economic changes till better times. The flourishing black market and "shadow economy" are a direct consequence of the absence of any legal market, regulated by law. It is simply one of the many effects of a degradating economic system (or anti-economic system, to be more exact) rigidly controlled by government bureaucracy. The "Soviet bourgeoisie" and the tycoons of the "shadow economy," who are the main targets of UFWP criticism, are thriving on the crisis, and among them there are quite a few representatives from the state bureaucracy, from the party, from the trade unions, and from trading and ministry officials. A state-regulated socialist market could place the enterprising spirit and the initiative of the people at the service of the whole of society. Only by creating such a market will it be possible to undermine the strength of the underground magnates. However, price reform and an inheritance tax will never help achieve this goal. The shadow economy draws its support from the system of bureaucratic economic management which causes perennial crises and deficits. Only the most naive believe this "bourgeoisie" can be done away with through measures which aim to extract money from them.

The point is these people need not keep this money in bank accounts or, better still, stuffed away in stockings. They have ample opportunity to invest it in material values or turn it into convertible currency.

The better educated part of the working class does not have these opportunities, nor do engineers, highly skilled while-collar workers, peasants working on profitable collective farms or selling their home-grown produce in the marketplace, as well as all those who work under more difficult climatic conditions in remote areas of the country. All of these people have moderately high incomes but cannot spend the money on the consumer market. These people will suffer most from regressive monetary reform.

More dangerous still, would be a complete loss of trust in the government and its economic policies which could come as a result of such reform. What law-based state would try to overcome its difficulties by confiscating the property of its own citizens? These measures can only exacerbate general economic chaos and deepen the social and political crisis. In seeking to block illegal channels of moneymaking, one can't resort to Stalinist repression against the majority of the working people. To achieve the goal, one must primarily create the nescessary economic and legal mechanisms.

One of the most controversial issues which always provokes furious conservative resentment, is the issue of different forms of ownership, including private property. The argument that private property is inexorably linked to capitalism with its exploitation of wage workers may well sound plausible to many people here. After all, their theoretical erudition relies mostly on streotypes and dogmas which have nothing to do with modern economic reality. As Marxism has it, exploitation exists in as much as the owner of the means of production pays the wage worker only part of what he or she has earned, namely, that part which constitutes the cost of his or her labour (and is required to restore his or her working capabilities) while retaining the remainder of what has been produced, i.e., surplus value. At the time of Marx and Lenin the appropriation of surplus value, or part of it, was typical of wage labour relations. The phenomenon still exists, yet in industrialized countries the worker now gets (in the form of a wage or salary) a sum which far exceeds his or her immediate needs.

Moreover, today capitalism makes wide use of modern technology wherein large production units are serviced and operated by a small number of highly skilled and highly paid specialists. In these conditions, the exploitation of the working people ceases to be the capitalist's chief source of profit. One more widely spread stereotype calls for a correction, and that is the idea that the high living standards of working people in industrialized countries result from the exploitation of people in the Third World. Research conducted by authoritative Soviet and a number of foreign economists proves that this thesis is wrong. It is an open secret that a number of developing countries make good use of foreign capital and the investments of transnational corporations, and thus, create dynamic thriving economies which guarantee rising living standards for their own working people.

Behind the change in the socio-economic content of the wage labour relations lies high economic efficiency and the development of high tech, as well as a bigger say for the working people at all levels of the decision-making process, from the shop floor to state policies.

This experience could help perestroyka. It demonstrates the possibility of averting the social dangers inherent in private property by implementing democratic control over its use. It shows that these dangers may be avoided if the state protects the interests of the working people and if they are guaranteed a say on issues related to their economic rights. As for the present situation in this country, the real scourge for the working people is an utter lack of social protection and ever-present poverty, caused not by private property, but by bureaucratic rule which has taken on the form of overt exploitation. Economic evolution and increased democratization are the only remedies.

Dictatorship and democracy

Where is the positive part of the platform of the UFWP? It seeks to secure economic progress through a "cost-effective" economy that is to be shaped through centralized introduction of high tech. Centralized planning will allow for an adequate supply of goods and services to meet the needs of the working people with the help of information data banks. The same methods are to be used to guarantee the use of ecologically clean technologies. Thus, it wil be up to the allmighty Centre to decide what your or my needs should be, or indeed what the production quotas should be for each particular enterprise. Thus the need for modern computers. An order issued "from above" will remain the sole impetus for economic development. In a nutshell, what we are offered is not just a return of the administrative-command system, but the revival of the familiar "war communism," dressed in catchy words like "cost-effective economy" and "information data bank."

There is nothing "novel" in the political platform of the UFWP.

It contains quite a few democratic slogans born in the times of perestroyka: an end to the privileges of the party and state apparatus, direct elections of all party committees including the Central Commitee and calls for purging the party of corrupt elements. All would be well if only these calls were not incorporated into the framework of one principal requirement - that of "the dictatorship of the working class" (see for example speeches by R. Kosolapov). Meanwhile our own history is the best example of the sad consequences which result from attempts to combine dictatorship with democracy. Any dictatorial rule is always based on repression, under such rule, the powers of the leader are unlimited and any opposition or dissent is unthinkable. This rule is characterized by the concentration of power in a few hands at the top. The majority of the people, including the working class on whose behalf the authorities speak, is denied any say. Today the slogan of a "dictatorship" of one class" can only mean a return to totalitarianism, even though this "dictatorship" is to be achieved through democratic elections by constituencies or by setting quotas for the workers who are to be represented in the higher party and state bodies of power.

The democratic renewal of our society might never come about if the working class is not behind it. Recent developments, including the miners' strikes, points to the growing participation of the workers in the process of political change. Those who seek to isolate the workers from the rest of society, its democratic movements and institutions, are in fact - whether they want to or not - pushing them back to helpless dependence on the state, i.e., the position they were in before perestroyka began.

A moment of truth

The results of the February plenum of the Communist Party Central Committee have taken many people in this country and abroad completely by surprise. The consolidation of conservatives against the background of the ever deepening crisis, sometimes taking for form of national calamity, posed a serious threat to the couse of perestroyka. A British sovietologist I spoke with about three weeks before the plenum looked troubled when he asked me if Gorbachev was not going to fall from power. The plenum's decisions were the biggest defeat of the conservatives to date.

They owe this defeat to two major factors. The first is the consistent stance of Gorbachev himself who, despite uncertainty in the economic policy of the country's leadership and inconsistency in the tackling of ethnic unrest, reiterated the goal of attaining a "democratic and humane socialism."

The second factor was the backing of the people, at least of the more politically active part of them, who made their views clear at a crucial point in time, right before the start of the plenum. Had it not been for a score of "regional revolutions," mass rallies and manifestations in support of democracy and perestroyka, had it not been for the trend towards more democracy inside the party itself, the outcome of the plenum could have been totally different. It was these events that shaped the position of many of the participants in the plenum, who only a month before would have taken any talk of amending Article 6 of the Constitution, of a multiparty system, or of a more democratic party, to be nothing but heresy. These people have learned that only by backing Gorbachev and his policies can they hope to retain their present position (whether these hopes are realistic I am not sure). Meanwhile, the mass movement helped bolster the position of that part of the party apparatus which is guided by common sense. These party leaders fully realize the significance and scope of change sweeping the country and seek honestly to adapt their policies to it.

However, it would be a dangerous misconception to speak about a total and unquestionable victory of the radicals. The plenum set the political stage for the resolution of many crucial problems of perestroyka—economic or national—but it was far from finding solutions to them. The success of the plenum derives from the bloc between the top political leadership and the popular movement. However, for this bloc to consolidate and for the policy of perestroyka to succeed, the entire power structure should be radically reformed. Its lineup should be changed and methods of work reviewed. Otherwise we would still be facing the impasse described by one of hte speakers at the plenum, a miner, who said that the people are separated from the political leadership by a barricade made up of the apparatus which considerably hampers the progress of perestroyka. We should remember this as we approach the elections to local Soviet and party bodies.

Trade Union Congress Elects Officials, Concludes

LD2303224990 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 23 Mar 90

[By special TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 23 TASS— By special TASS correspondents: The Russian Federation, the largest Soviet republic, has made an important step towards strengthening its sovereignty—the founding Congress of Russian Trade Unions, which ended in the Kremlin today, proclaimed the creation of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions and elected their leading bodies.

Unlike other union republics, the Russian Federation's trade unions, number 77 million members (54 per cent of the total number of Soviet trade unionists) have had no centre of their own.

The establishment of the federation of independent trade unions of Russia reflect the process of democratization of the country's trade union movement.

The congress endorsed the basic principles of the organizational structure and activity of their new trade union centre and emphasized that the federation of Russia's independent trade unions is a voluntary union of working people's trade associations, independent of state, economic management and political organisations.

Civil Engineer Igor Klochkov, 51, who was in recent years deputy chairman of the All-Union Central Committee of Trade Unions, was elected by a secret ballot as the head of the Federation of Russia's Independent Unions.

The congress adopted a statement condemning any attempts to split the working people's ranks. "Ethnic or regional separatism, sectoral isolation, dangerous manifestations of which are visible now, will inevitably lead to the disintegration of the country's trade union movement and considerably weaken the trade unions' protective potential," the statement notes.

The congress called for strengthening the Soviet Union as "the most important guarantor of peaceful work and free development of all nations and nationalities".

Article Debunking Marx Legacy Rebutted

*PM3003150190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2*

[S. Zemlyanoy "Polemical Notes": "On 'Last Words' and Cruel Truths"]

[Text] The philosophical revolution, the need for which has been spoken of by leading theoreticians of the new political thinking, has evidently become a reality. It has emerged from the hidden phase, when the chief thing in what was happening still remained outside the public field of vision, into the phase of increasingly broad and increasingly acute debates on fundamental philosophical questions—debates which are electrifying the spiritually active section of the people. Something else is no less important—the philosophical revolution is faced with elaborating a creative attitude toward Marxism, including Marxism in its Leninist version.

There is no lack of arguments, assumptions, or guesses as to what this attitude is now and what it could be in the future. There is, of course, the stand expressed in the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress: "While confirming loyalty to the creative spirit of a materialist world outlook and the dialectical methodology of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and being guided by it, we resolutely reject ideological blinkeredness, dogmatism, and intolerance of other views and ideas." It used to be sufficient to refer to this point in a party document in order to end a discussion which essentially had not had time to get going. Now it is an invitation to a debate.

Yu. Burtin's political-ideological two-part article "Achilles' Heel of Marx' Historical Theory," which he contributed to the journal OKTYABR (nos. 11-12, 1989), was of great interest to me personally. A desire for "last words" is very noticeable with Burtin: Without a moment's hesitation he declares "old" Marxism the property of the past, and "modern" Marxism something unnatural, like baked ice.

The work gives the reader a definite ideological orientation. In accordance with this, the author builds an exposition in a conceptual key, refers constantly to the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and cites them copiously. This is what impresses someone like me: Nowadays such punctiliousness in the discussion of Marxism is a great rarity. Yu. Burtin's determination, proclaimed at the very beginning of his two-part article, to ignore all taboos, to be totally honest with himself and the reader, and to state in full all that he thinks about Marxism and all the cruel truths about it that he has managed to discover undoubtedly disposes one toward him. All this is appropriate, and it is quite impossible without all this now. For all that, however, while paying tribute to the author's boldness and sincerity, I strongly doubt that these "cruel" truths of his make up or will ever make up the "whole truth" which he is seeking about Marxism. And I doubt it, primarily, because he is guided in all his conclusions and inferences by an amazingly unproductive and strangely poor, if not to say poverty-stricken, general conception of what Marxism is and is not.

The author is, to all appearances, in thrall to his own education, obtained and greatly augmented at a time when precisely this image of Marxism was "introduced" into the public consciousness by our orthodox ideologues.

This is the impression I get, not least because the intellectual and historical-philosophical part of the task of decanonizing Marxism, which the philosophical revolution has placed on the agenda, still largely remains unfulfilled. The appropriate time has arrived to acknowledge that at various stages the creativity of Marx, Engels, and Lenin assumed different theoretical forms within which the correlation between its philosophical, political economic, and political constituents was ordered somewhat differently.

If there is one thing more than any other that does not come off in Burtin's interpretation of Marxism, it is the method. It is a question of the method of historical dialectics.

"A materialist understanding of history and its special application to the modern class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie have been made possible only with the help of dialectics," F. Engels pointed out back in 1882 (Vol. 19, pp 322-323). Only complete amnesia with regard to this fundamental circumstance and ignorance of the specific type of scientificness of historical materialism associated with its dialectical methodology can account for (although not excuse) the striking carelessness with which Yu. Burtin makes long speeches on the "philosophical-historical concept of Marxism" (No. 11, p 3). There is no such thing at all, because it simply does not exist—historical materialism took shape as the surmounting and abolition of the Western philosophy of history, being its opposite in the methodological respect.

The author really should have pondered Marx' statement, which he himself cites, in which Marx denies any similarity between historical materialism and any "universal master key" to the past and the present in the form of some philosophical-historical theory (Vol. 19, p 121). You see, if he had done this, he would not have ascribed to Marx—who considered world history the result of mankind's long development, not the premise for it—the teaching on "successive stages of a unified world history" through which all societies must pass. Then the author would certainly have recalled all the variants of Marx' reply to V. Zasulich's question on the future of the Russian community, where the category of historical natural law appears in its dialectical understanding and application.

But no. The author has a different interest.

This interest consists in discovering "the mistake, the extremely important mistake, of Marx" (No. 11, p 5). This is, quite frankly, an honorable and worthy task, and one can only welcome the fact that someone labored to point out what was, after all, "the mistake of a mind of genius, which contemporaries are unable to expose but which is revealed only by the subsequent course of science or of history itself" (No. 11, p 5).

The chief thing is to find the mistake. According to Yu. Burtin's own wording, "it is quite clear today that the essence of Marx' mistake, which is of interest to us, consists in the underestimation of the capitalist society's ability to change itself" (No. 11, p 5). This underestimation is manifested in the fact that Marx denies capitalism's ability to find effective means of resolving its own contradictions and on this basis prophesies its doom. In Yu. Burtin's opinion, Marxism is characterized by the thesis of insuperable limits, which the capitalist form of management places on the path of the development of production forces (No. 11, p 22), and the hushing up of the positive social aspects of the market economy (No. 11, p 23).

Being a dialectician, Marx conceives of the process of capitalist development as being contradictory. And Yu. Burtin wrongly proclaims him an adherent of the viewpoint according to which capitalism is incapable of coping with its contradictions. This is a misunderstanding. The entire history of capitalist commodity production, as portrayed by Marx, attests to the reverse: It is a history of the development and resolution of the contradictions enshrined in the commodity phenomenon. Only it is necessary to understand correctly, i.e. dialectically, what this resolution of contradictions consists in. "The development of the commodity," Marx writes, "does not remove these contradictions but creates a form for their movement. This, in general, is the method by which real contradictions are resolved. Thus, for example, a contradiction consists in the fact that one body continuously falls onto another and continuously moves away from it. An ellipse is one of the forms of movement in which this contradiction is simultaneously both realized and resolved" (Vol. 23, pp 113-114). It is clear from this that to follow Yu. Burtin in claiming that Marx does not permit the thought that capitalism can discover new "means of resolving its own contradictions" (No. 11, p 7) is tantamount to mouthing a deliberate absurdity.

According to Marx, the conditions for production based on capital are the study of all of nature and the development of natural science to the highest point; the universal exchange of all countries' products; the creation of more and more new sectors of production; the opening up, creation, and satisfaction of the new requirements engendered by society; the cultivation of all the properties of the social person as a person with the richest possible properties and ties (Vol. 46, part 1, p 386). The positive, human aspect of capitalist development and the historic purpose of the school of capitalist production in no way elude Marx: It will, by the way, be carried out only when "universal diligence, thanks to the strict discipline of capital through which the generations have passed one after another, develops as the universal property of the new generation" (Vol. 46, part 1, p 280).

I would not like to be misinterpreted: I have no intention of following P. Struve's example and turning Marx into an apologist for capitalism. True, in his concepts capitalist production knows and tolerates no external limits on the enhancement of its efficiency, and capitalism "destroys all obstacles which slow up the development of production forces" (Vol. 46, part 1, p 387). But it does not follow from this that capital is the absolute form of such development: There is an internal boundary, an immanent limit, "a limitation contradicting the universal tendency of capital to overstep any production limit" (Vol. 46, part 1, p 393). These limits coincide with the very nature of capitalism and capitalist competition.

Marx' teaching on the limits of capitalism's development is to this day the most profound, theoretically unsurpassed self-criticism of Western civilization and the most profound substantiation of the socialist prospect. Capitalism preserves its capacity for progress and "acts as a condition of the development of production forces as long as the latter need external spurring" (Vol. 46, part 1, p 393).

Commodity-money relations, the market, competition—these are the most effective of the means of such external spurring of production that mankind has so far found. But the more efficiently they work and the more all-embracing the nature that they assume, the greater the mass of negative consequences that they arouse and the more refined the alienation of man to which they lead. Capitalism "creates a system of universal exploitation of natural and human properties, a system of universal usefulness; even science, just like all man's physical and spiritual properties, acts only as the bearer of this system of universal usefulness, and there is nothing outside this circle of social production and exchange that would act as something higher in itself, as lawful in itself" (Vol. 46, part 1, p 386).

This world-historical practical empiricism which capitalism brings with it, this pragmatically-oriented rationality, the alienation which has become a total social fact—this is one of the sociocultural causes of the degradation of nature under the onslaught of civilization, of the spiritual and moral crisis of modern times, and of the global problems which mankind has encountered. The desire to be aware of ways to overcome these limits in the development of Western capitalist civilization is one of the driving forces behind the philosophical revolution.

In a certain sense Lenin was even unluckier than Marx in Yu. Burtin's two-part article: While casting theoretical stones at Marx, at least our author does not deny the inner integrity of his thinking—unlike Lenin's. Yu. Burtin comes up with a teaching on "two Lenins." "The Lenin of the age of 'war communism' and the Lenin of his last works are in many ways two different people"

(No. 12, p 37). Here, of course, he refers to Lenin's thesis on the change in the whole view of socialism, which he sees as something like Lenin's belated repentance and an attempt at "self-justification" (No. 12, p 39).

Yu. Burtin is not able or does not wish to reckon with the fact that for Marx, Engels, and Lenin (particularly Lenin) socialism was not an ideal but a movement; not something given but a process; not a being but a coming into being. The starting point for their reflections on socialism is not theoretical schemes or philosophical principles but the real interests of a real class, the social problems which have to be resolved in conformity with these interests, and the means and possibilities which have taken shape for this in life.

It stems from this that the substance and problems of socialist theory are not something given in advance and self-identical: They derive from social practice. The specific understanding of socialism—just like socialism itself—is a product of the struggle being waged for it and a coagulum of the experience of revolutionary transforming activity. From this viewpoint the change in Lenin's conceptual images of socialism is not just explicable but also natural. Socialist society as a factory; as a national economy organized like a trust along German lines; as an aggregate of producing and consuming communes; as a system of civilized cooperative members—we can find all these images of socialism in Lenin.

It is also necessary to be able to read the problem-based reality that lies behind each of them. I believe, for example, that it is impossible to understand clearly why and to what extent Lenin paid tribute to the ideology of "war communism" unless you take account of the fact that the problem of implementing a package of emergency measures to avert the national catastrophe that was approaching Russia and to resolve the "main" task, as Lenin saw it—that of "preserving human society" ("Complete Collected Works," Vol. 36, p 400)—was, along with other problems, the reality from which Lenin's thought proceeded during the first years following the October Revolution. Lenin's ideas on the nature of those measures were derived by him largely from experience of the wartime economies of European countries.

The image of socialism as a system of civilized cooperative members arose in a somewhat different problem context—that of the transition from the politics of civil war to the politics of civil peace and the abandonment of attempts to arrange a "normal existence" (Vol. 36, p 266) through willful pressure and violence, which, according to Lenin, cannot be achieved "at a single blow, nor by decree (just as you cannot rouse or make whole by order someone you have beaten half to death). It takes lengthy work" (Vol. 36, p 549).

Amending his former views to some extent, V.I. Lenin takes his own, totally original stand in the dispute—decisive for Russian social thought—between the Westerners and the Slavophiles over our country's historical path. He proposes a third path between simple association with Western civilization and the assimilation of its economic forms, and original development by means of the productive principles connected with the rural community, etc. This path, substantiated by Lenin in the article "On Our Revolution," did not lead away from the general world line of development, as Yu. Burtin tries to prove (No. 12, p 40), but opened up the possibility of a different kind of transition to the creation of the basic premises of panhuman civilization—different to that in Western countries.

To put it briefly, this path consisted in Lenin's "seriously and long" planned combination of three factors of progress, to ensure the resolution of the colossal problems facing the country: the soviets as the most democratic self-managing mass organization of working people; state capitalism in urban industry and trade in its most advanced, German-U.S. organizational forms; and the system of civilized cooperative members in the countryside, reviving the viable communal traditions of the Russian peasantry. After Lenin's death our country departed from that path, which had promised it a different future to that which it was fated to experience under Stalin and after him.

With this I could probably conclude my analysis of Yu. Burtin's "last words" and "cruel truths" about Marxism.

But in conclusion I will cite quite an interesting thought of B. Brecht's on a similar topic to ours: "When people find bronze or iron articles among debris, they ask the question: What kind of implements were they? What was their purpose? If they are weapons, it means people fought with them; if they are adornments, it means people traded them. Diverse options and possibilities are considered. Why do they not treat the ideas of former times in just the same way?"

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Reader on Sobchak

PM0903144190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by G. Mokeyev, Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic honored science and technology worker, senior lecturer, and technical sciences candidate, under the general heading "Letter on 'Cooperative Lobby' Sent to Editorial Office": "Listen to Yourselves"]

[Text] Moscow—USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak's speech on Leningrad television 4 March 1990 moved me to write these notes. It made a strange and contradictory impression. The very manner and tone of his speech and its categorical and aggressive nature and obvious claims to be the ultimate arbiter of truth inevitably provoked a feeling of protest. The ease with which Comrade Sobchak hurled the most insulting expressions and accusations at his opponents was striking.

For example, when he argues with the authors of an article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA of 25 February this year (the article "The Warped Orbit. Who Is Defending the Cooperatives' Monopoly and Why" by Yu. Vorobevskiy and A. Golovenko) and some other earlier articles (on the events in Tbilisi in particular), Comrade Sobchak, forgetting his responsibility for every word he says as a deputy, takes the liberty of insulting SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and its authors out of hand.

What a strong feeling of hatred he must have to make such attacks against what is essentially the only mass Russian newspaper that serves Russia's peoples with faith and truth and defends their vital interests firmly and courageously. Unlike some "defenders" of Russia from among the ultrademocrats and "radicals," this newspaper is the one that boldly speaks out against corruption and mismanagement and against the bigwigs of the shadow economy. It is this newspaper that supports the rebirth of Russian culture and Russians' national consciousness and the strengthening of Russia's sovereignty and might.

However, the esteemed people's deputy does not see all this. Moreover, blinded by his anger, he increasingly raises his tone and bombards the airwaves with accusations of a political provocation with far-reaching aims. In short, these aims, in his opinion, consist first in launching a new large-scale attack against cooperative workers and their patrons and second in compromising deputies A. Sobchak and V. Tikhonov. It is difficult not to notice the threats in his words....

Obviously Deputy Sobchak was very offended both personally and on behalf of Comrade Tikhonov. He very much wanted to convince the viewers that the cooperatives have no patrons in our parliament and that all that is pure fiction. Alas, he could not quote any convincing proof.

The televised monologue ended at this point, leaving you with a feeling of distressing mistrust and unease. It was clear that the struggle for "the honor of the regiment" was not over. And sure enough, first IZVESTIYA published another interview with A. Sobchak and then ARGUMENTY I FAKTY (No. 9) published an article by V. Tikhonov under the highly significant heading "Freak of the Imagination," where he states categorically: Everything is based on the lies and conjectures of the article's authors.

That is the position. It can be easily noted that the esteemed deputy does not stand on ceremony with his opponents. His vocabulary includes "conjectures," "lies," and "inventions...." Unfortunately there are again no facts or convincing proof. A reader who tries to get to the truth is forced to search for these facts in a boundless sea of articles in newspapers and periodicals. I, too, managed to discover by chance some curious notes, which, in my opinion, could throw some light on this story. I have in mind Alla Obolevich's report published 21 February in the Riga newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH.

The article begins with a very loud and emotional appeal: "Don't be Afraid, Don't Believe, Don't Beg" are the principles by which People's Deputy Vladimir Tikhonov, president of the USSR United Cooperatives Union, advised the participants in the Extraordinary All-Union Cooperative Workers' Conference to live. The author of the article goes on to bring to readers' attention a short synopsis of some of the speeches from this conference, which took place in Moscow and which was held, in his opinion, because of attacks on the cooperative system that have intensified of late. I propose that readers familiarize themselves with the fundamental "theses" of the conference speeches as expounded by SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH.

"Vladimir Tikhonov proposed a survival program to those who had gathered:

"—to participate actively in the March elections—to campaign for 'your' candidates and against their rivals and speak at preelection meetings. Separating 'your' candidates from the 'others' is easy: The supporters of the cooperative system are always supporters of a market economy and democratic freedoms;

"—to cooperate with the interregional group of USSR people's deputies;

"—to establish links with the USSR small and medium entrepreneurs' association and the association of peasant farms and to jointly create insurance funds for mutual assistance....

"To struggle more resolutely, using all possible forms of civil disobedience: boycotts, denunciations, the banning of unlawful checks in cooperatives, the holding of rallies, and campaigning for the dismissal of officials who have compromised themselves."

Vice President of the USSR United Cooperatives Union Artem Tarasov painted a terrible picture in his speech:

"It is possible that this is our last meeting. If we do not take active action, then in three months most of us will be in prison or living abroad....

"We need political protection. Unfortunately we do not have very many means of struggle: Neither strikes nor refusing to pay taxes suits us—all this will only work against us. One of our few means of struggle is our ability to pay. And we have to pay with money today so that we do not have to pay with our lives and our freedom tomorrow. It is unlikely that we are capable of forming our own party which would protect our interests in parliament. Therefore, I ask you to support the interregional deputies' group, which is trying to unite all the country's progressive left-wing forces.

"We make up 4.5 million people and I appeal to every cooperative worker and every cooperative to think about it and transfer a sum of money to the interregional deputies' group in order to create a new opposition party."

USSR People's Deputy Arkadiy Murashev, a guest at the conference, came to the rostrum to give the number of the interregional deputies' group's account, but he started off with these words:

"There is little point in talking about torture-chambers now, and here I totally disagree with Artem Tarasov. I believe that after the March elections, the CPSU's authority will be seriously shaken and the situation will become more favorable for the cooperatives.

(A. Murashev went on to give the interregional deputies' group's account number—author's note)

"Academician Vladimir Tikhonov joined in Artem Tarasov's appeal...."

Of course the debate about whether there is a "cooperative lobby" in our parliament or not could be continued. But it seems to me that what has been said in these notes is quite sufficient for a perfectly simple conclusion to be drawn.

Official Interviewed on Cable Television Program

LD2203200890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] Correspondent O. Bobin notes that cable television in a neighborhood district makes it possible not only to provide a stable television picture, but also to provide one's own television programs. They have already appeared in the Moscow rayons of Saburovo and Cheremushki, the Gorkiy motor vehicle works' young people's residential complex, and at other places in our country. A cable television association has already been set up in the Ukraine. [Video shows the ostankino television tower, aerials on the tops of high-rise apartments and illustrative diagrams] The process has been underway for a long time in the advanced countries. Now at last we have joined in. Our House of Creativity has recently hosted a conference on cable television. [Video shows delegates at a conference; interview with V.A. Tkachev, senior lecturer at the Far Eastern University].

Tkachev says: "The State Committee on Television and Radio Broadcasting has already done very much, and now has an understanding attitude to the need for alternative television. If one is talking of cable television, then it is part of the big undertaking of developing new television in our country."

Bobin states: "In the future this means not only new television channels but also an all-union system, making it possible to gather economic and ecological information." [Video shows conference delegates viewing notice board] Bobin continues: "The notice board is of interest. Here the representatives of defense-industry plants that have commenced conversion announce that they are ready to accept orders for equipment, and various amateur studios are already offering programs." Our television is thus entering the age of new cable television—television with a broader potential.

Komsomol Central Committee Plenum Opens 22 Mar

LD2203122590 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 22 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Budris and Galina Vinnitskaya]

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League [YCL] (Komsomol)—a Soviet public and political youth organization with a membership of 31 million—opened here today. Its agenda includes the discussion of documents and materials for the forthcoming extraordinary 21st YCL congress—its program and rules. A report of the YCL Central Committee will be delivered at the meeting.

The prestige of Komsomol, long regarded as a "loyal assistant to the party," has been tarnished in the past several years. Its membership reduced by 10 million in comparison with 1985. A congress of Komsomol organisations of the Russian Federation, held here a month ago, also discussed the crisis in Komsomol.

Young people of this country hope that the forthcoming congress will bring about its renewal. At present Komsomol includes the recognized opposition—the so-called "Surgut Alternative," named after the Siberian city where it emerged in 1989—and other groups of the social democratic, socialist and other orientations.

Vladimir Zyukin, secretary of the YCL Central Committee, told TASS that the Central Committee favoured the renewal of this youth organization, but opposed its split. At the same time, the Komsomol supports the creation of other youth organizations and is ready to help them, including financially.

Economic

Tyumen Oil Workers Continue 'Labor Dispute'

LD0104162490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Our listeners obviously already know that the oil workers of Tyumen have entered into a labor dispute with the country's government. A specific date was named for fulfillment of their demands—April. Today is the beginning of April. So what is the situation in the region? Our correspondent Aleksandr Shvedtsov reports:

[Shvedtsov] I shall give a brief reminder of the essence of the oil workers' demands. They can, as it were, be divided into several basic parts. First, the northerners are standing up for their right to decide for themselves how to dispose of part of the oil which they extract—let's say, 1 million tonnes. By selling this oil abroad for specific ends, it would be possible to get back 100,000 tonnes and resolve many social issues using the proceeds. A million tonnes of oil is in essence one day's work for all the Tyumen fields.

Second, the state order for this year for delivery of hydrocarbon fuel is very intensive, and so far it is not been backed up by the material-technical and financial resources. This jeopardizes its fulfillment, which is also of great concern to the oil workers. There are issues concerning the norms for deductions in favor of the state budget, and a number of others. In principle, the demands are all legitimate today, with the industry working in conditions of financial autonomy.

The oil workers of the famous Samotlor fields decided to enter into a labor dispute with the government following repeated calls to the very highest authorities. Their constructive demands were drafted and adopted at a conference of the many-thousands-strong labor collective of the Nizhnevartovskneftegaz association. The package of their demands is presently in Moscow. The first meetings and talks have already taken place in the Council of Ministers. The government has asked for time to adopt decisions.

As for the persistent talk about the Tyumen oil workers being ready to shut off the valves at oilfields on 1 April, this is nothing but very unhealthy rumor. I have been on the telephone to many northern towns since this morning, and I have also spoken with the central engineering and technical service of Glavtyumenneftegaz [main Tyumen oil and gas extraction directorate]. There have been no incidents, even less so strikes, and normal work is going on at the oilfields. On the contrary, the northerners intend to fight for their rights only on a legitimate basis. They expect clear and definite answers to all the questions from the country's government, and they expect energetic measures to create normal working and living conditions in the region.

USSR Economy Could Cause Government To Fall

AU3103151290 Paris AFP in English 1218 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 31 (AFP)—The top Soviet official overseeing the country's economic reforms believes the government "will resign or be forced to resign" if the slumping Soviet economy does not stabilize by next autumn. Leonid Abalkin, first deputy prime minister who is in charge of Soviet economic reform, made the statement to economic journalists whose article was printed Saturday by INTERFAX, a Radio Moscow publication. He said the Soviet Union was on the verge of "very important decisions" regarding the economy, and the two necessary ingredients for improvement were "a strong leadership and one that has the confidence and support of the people." Mr. Abalkin said the economy had slumped even more since his nomination eight months ago. At that time, he had given himself a 15-month deadline to introduce substantive reforms aimed at reorienting the planned, centralized economy and stopping its continual decline. He quoted a few figures from the start of the year, "a year that otherwise should have been marked by some improvement." In January and February, industrial production dropped by one per cent over the same period last year, while wages increased by 11.2 per cent, Mr. Abalkin said. "If these two contradictory tendencies continue, it will be impossible to improve the situation in the country and it will continue to get worse and worse as time goes on," he said. "Radical reform would be impossible without the confidence of the people," he said. "We need mutual confidence, understanding and civil peace more than anything else right now."

'Emergency' Export Controls Imposed

PM3103163290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with V. Draganov, deputy chief of USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration of State Customs Control, by IZVESTIYA correspondent G. Alimov; date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction: "Emergency Measure: New Export Restrictions Imposed"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution "On Regulating the Crossing of the USSR State Border by Citizens and on Additional Measures To Regulate Exports of Consumer Goods." IZVESTIYA's correspondent met with V. Draganov, deputy chief of the USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration of State Customs Control.

[Alimov] Valeriy Gavrilovich, similar decisions have been adopted before. And now a new resolution, new restrictions. What prompted them?

[Draganov] This is an emergency measure. The adoption of yet another resolution was dictated by new conditions: The consumer market is becoming increasingly bare. The situation is further complicated by the fact that we are seeing a growth in the activities of mafia groups which get hold of scarce industrial and food products by the "back door" and export them. The decisions adopted earlier proved insufficient. Tougher measures were needed to protect the already devastated market. It was necessary immediately to halt the mass export of goods, expecially from border regions, and the gradual removal of consumer products from the country.

[Alimov] Strong language. Could you, by way of illustration, give at least a few examples of this, how can I put it, orgy of mercenary passions?

[Draganov] By all means. Take Chop. About 350 Soviet tourists and citizens leaving the USSR on personal business recently blockaded the "Tisa" post. They demanded the lifting of restrictions on the export of above-norm quantities of food products and consumer goods. It took a reinforced militia detail to impose order. As a result they confiscated 200 sets of bedding, 20 bicycles, six power saws, and other goods that are not supposed to be exported. People take out through the "Tisa" post literally everything your heart could desire: matches and mixers, canned foods and electric drills, cervelat and salami, cheeses and buckets, mousetraps and electric irons, butter and children's toys, socks and underwear, gloves and metalworking tools, rice and sugar, chocolate and toothpaste, black pepper and crockery. Please note: Many of these goods and food products are quickly snapped up in our own stores.

The picture is much the same at the country's other customs posts.

[Alimov] Forgive me, Valeriy Gavrilovich, but what is the point of confiscating goods at customs if the very same peddlers are given them back on their return. Of course, it may console you that the goods stay in the country....

[Draganov] And that is of some importance. By means of reducing to two to three days the time for which confiscated goods are held, we are now "cutting off the oxygen supply" to the dealers. Goods that are not allowed through customs are returned to the counters in ordinary stores.

[Alimov] But these are common or garden speculators. Why should honest people suffer on their account? Why declare a customs war on them?

[Draganov] Not on everyone, not on everyone. On those who see only the commercial side of tourism and pursue just one goal: to "sort out" their own trading and financial affairs, get hold of foreign currency, and acquire shortage goods so as to be able to sell them here at three times the price later. For some people, this has become an industry.

[Alimov] Everyone will want to know which goods are on the list of prohibited exports.

[Draganov] Within the terms of the government resolution, we have adopted very rigorous bans—they are temporary, and are confined to the year 1990. The list of industrial and food goods which it is prohibited to export from the USSR this year is quite long. It includes car batteries, electric cable and wire, metalworking and fitting tools, tires, spare parts and accessories for means of transportation, construction materials, furs and fur products (with the exception of items of clothing belonging to the person traveling), coffee, cocoa, spices, caviar and salmon roe, meat and meat products, animal and vegetable oils and fats, eggs and egg products, fish however processed, canned fish and crustacea, walnuts, almonds, mushrooms, honey, sugar and confectionery, groats, and other unprocessed foods. All types of textiles, carpets, table and bed linen, domestic refrigeration cupboards and compartments (refrigerators and freezers), bicycles, cameras and photographic equipment, domestic electrical appliances, vacuum cleaners, domestic washing, sewing, and knitting machines, and domestic radioelectronic equipment.

[Alimov] To whom specifically does this resolution apply?

[Draganov] To everyone leaving the country on private business, on tourist trips, and for recreation and therapy. And to foreigners, of course.

But let me explain: The measures we have stipulated do not apply to industrial and food goods, including fuel and lubricants, if they were acquired in the USSR for foreign currency, in specialized stores and other organizations which are permitted, according to the procedure laid down, to engage in such trade.

[Alimov] You said that these measures are temporary. Do you have the right, depending on the situation on the consumer market, to lift the bans on particular goods?

[Draganov] We can make individual amendments by agreement with the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission. We also have the right, on the basis of the purpose of the visit and the duration of the journey, to set value and quantity norms for food products in cases not covered by this government resolution.

[Alimov] Do you think the new list of restrictions closes all the loopholes?

[Draganov] Of course not. You cannot declare bans on everything. We realize that the problems of the consumer market cannot be unraveled solely by means of imposing bans. The violators of customs rules adapt to bans quicker than anything; they promptly change the range of exported goods, to bypass the bans.

The subsequent course of events will depend largely on the successful or unsuccessful steps taken in the economic reform in the country, on effective legislative incentives (tax concessions, subsidies, and so forth) for the production of consumer goods, and on the market mechanism becoming fully operational. Then such bans would disappear of their own accord. But for the time being, in order to stabilize the consumer market, it is necessary to adopt these emergency, desperate measures.

List of Exports Requiring Licenses Expanded

PM3003135090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] By Resolution No. 151 of 10 February 1990 the USSR Council of Ministers approved an addendum to the list of products, the export of which is subject to licensing in accordance with USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 203 of 7 March 1989.

The procedure for licensing the timber, paper, chemical, and petrochemical products listed below is extended to all forms of foreign economic activity (including coastal and border trade, exchange (barter) operations, and operations through direct links) by enterprises, associations, production cooperatives, and other Soviet organizations.

The USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry is to issue export licenses for acetocyanohydrin; vinyl chloride; vinyl, ethyl, and other acetates; methylmethacrylate and other acrylates; hydrogen peroxide; chromium compounds; caustic soda and other sodium products; sodium sulfite; phthalic anhydride; lacquers and paints; toluene, xylenes, ethylbenzene and other aromatic hydrocarbons and their derivatives, including aromatic-containing intermediate products; the intermediate products and by-products of petroleum refining and petrochemical production processes, including components; distillate gatch and liquid paraffins; gaseous monomers and fractions from petroleum refining and petrochemical production processes; alcohols and aldehydes; petroleum solvents, acetone, and other petrochemical and chemical solvents; absorbents; tires, inner tubes, and other industrial rubber articles; polyethylene terephthalate; organic and inorganic acids; titanium dioxide and zinc oxide; fluoroplastics and fluoroplastic articles; by-products of the production of polymeric materials and chemical fibers; and pyrolitic resins.

The USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry is to issue export licenses for splint-slab and wood-fiber boards; charcoal parquet; wood oils; and rosin.

Licenses for adipic acid, tripolyphosphate, and simple polyethers will be issued by the state association "Agrokhim."

Aviation Industry Minister Views ANT Affair

PM3003134390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with A.S. Systsov, USSR minister of the aviation industry, by A. Protsenko: "ANT and the Others: Personal Opinion of A.S. Systsov, member of the government and USSR aviation industry minister, on the Trade in Weapons and Non-state Forms of Foreign Economic Activity"—date and place not specified]

[Text] [Protsenko] Apollon Sergeyevich, practically all the publications on ANT [Automation Equipment, Science, and Technology Association] mention the ministry headed by you. Opinions are being expressed that the Aviation Industry Ministry "spawned" this concern and should carry the can for it. Let us clarify matters: What was the Ministry's role in creating ANT?

[Systsov] Let us be precise here: Which ANT do you mean? The first ANT—the industrial state-cooperative association—was formed in Noginsk in 1987. Its leader was Ryashentsev. The second ANT—the intersector state-cooperative concern—was created by a USSR Council of Ministers decision in May-June last year. Or, to be more precise, the government instructed our ministry to join with the first ANT in creating the concern. In actual fact it took no part in the work and was not even officially registered: It had no board, it didn't even have a seal, and no contracts were concluded on the concern's behalf. True, it is mentioned in various documents, including government documents.

The aims behind the creation of ANT (or is it ANTs?!) were exhaustively discussed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, head of the government, at the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies: With ANT's help the country was able to sell abroad things which are not in acute need here at present or which we ourselves cannot use. In exchange we would receive consumer goods. Goods worth R6.5 billion in the first stage alone, with the overall program expected to be worth R35 billion. For comparison's sake I would remind you that last summer the government managed with great difficulty to allocate just $0.5 billion for extra import purchases, which produced goods worth R10 billion in retail prices. That is a substantial increase.

Admittedly, the ministry had a vested interest in creating the ANT concern. The Aviation Industry Ministry had been set an enormous target to increase consumer goods production. A target which cannot be met without modern equipment. With ANT's help we hoped to acquire that equipment abroad and create a number of joint ventures. But on 16 January the USSR Council of Ministers passed a decision to close the concern down and our plans were not implemented...

[Protsenko] But during that time the concern tried to sell 14 tanks abroad and negotiated for the sale of a consignment of MiG-29s. The concern is accused of shipping trainloads of scarce materials and equipment, including defense equipment, to the state border...

[Systsov] As I have already replied, the concern cannot be accused of these things because it hadn't even begun working. Claims may be made against the 'first ANT,' but it is not a question of names and addresses. Furthermore, our ministry did work with that ANT.

But let us look at the substance of the matter. I think that a clearly abnormal atmosphere of hysteria and psychosis has been created around the "ANT problem" itself now. I understand it when perfectly normal people feel angry and bewildered, but our citizens are poorly informed. Especially when they are fed some kind of thriller story claiming that a cooperative (!) is peddling tanks. People's attitude toward cooperatives is not especially favorable (with some from the mass media) and our citizens simply know nothing about the sale of weapons and military hardware. Then suddenly—a sensation breaks, accompanied by more and more revelations: Some irresponsible people, helped by "private dealers," are selling the Fatherland off lock, stock, and barrel, undermining the state's defense capability and economic might. In fact there is nothing strange or sinister going on here. Rather, it is a complex and painful process of demonopolizing foreign trade. Including the development of new forms not of state foreign economic activity but of state-cooperative foreign economic activity, as a more mobile, flexible form offering extensive opportunities for the organization of various deals. And it is during this process that things happen which are sometimes clearly abnormal and which need to be investigated.

I would immediately add here that I learned of the attempt to sell tanks from the press and that our ministry had no part in that operation. I consider the **way** this was done to be the grossest violation of our laws, but more on that later. First let us examine **what** happened?

Yes, modern tanks prepared for shipment abroad were suddenly discovered at Novorossiysk port. The deal was organized by ANT. But are they really the first tanks that our country has sold? By no means. Everyone knows that the Soviet Union supplies tanks to a whole series of countries. And we supply the kind of vehicles that were "picked up" in Novorossiysk port. Furthermore, the consignment of tanks which ANT tried to sell was not produced for our Armed Forces but was intended for export. At the last moment the partners canceled the deal, the plant had to send the goods somewhere—and that was when ANT stepped in. Note: Not a "private store" but a state-cooperative association, which transfers almost all the profit to the state budget.

[Protsenko] But the crime may lie elsewhere: To whom are we selling the weapons? After all, it cannot be ruled out that the purchaser in such a situation will be able to use our weaponry against our interests.

[Systsov] That's the main question: Who is buying? That, if you like, is where the state monopoly on weapons trading is (or should be!).

I repeat, since the Aviation Industry Ministry was not party to this operation, I have no information on who the addressee was. I assume that the supplies were destined for countries which have already received our tanks under intergovernmental agreements.

Regardless of that, I say again: The **way** this was done was totally unacceptable. There is a procedure—both in our country and in the rest of the world: Weapons are sold exclusively with the permission of the government, which decides who may buy and who may not. It decides the quantity that may be sold. And which weapons may be sold. It is not commercial interests but political interests that are paramount here; commerce is secondary.

[Protsenko] Nevertheless, ANT carried out market research and established the feasibility of selling MiG-29 fighters currently in service with our Air Force. Was that also dictated by political interests?

[Systsov] But without government permission there would be no sale, I can vouch for that. It would all have been as it was in the previous instance, when with ANT's help we began selling a large consignment of MiG-21 and MiG-23 fighter engines in capitalist countries.

What kind of deal was this? Back at the beginning of 1988, a number of Western firms put various proposals to us. In particular, they showed an interest in type R29-300 aeroengines, which are already being taken out of production. Our ministry studied those proposals, put its own proposal to the USSR Council of Ministers, and received permission to sell around 90 of these engines on the Western market over 2 years. The talks were started by our "Aviaeksport" organization, which then concluded an agreement with a Western intermediary and the matter seemed settled. But soon the intermediary began changing the terms of the contract (the figure was over $200 million), demanding special favors and privileges, and lowered the terms of the initial instalments. We rejected those demands and the firm then refused to honor the contracts.

Imagine our position: A lot of time had passed and essentially no progress had been made. It was then that ANT offered its services (that was actually how we became acquainted). By that time, the Aviation Industry Ministry had been instructed to triple the production of power units and motorized cultivators for agriculture: In 1989 production was 80,000, whereas the 1990 target was 250,000. I said that this was possible either by using foreign currency to buy equipment or by extensive cooperation with other ministries. We didn't get the foreign currency, it wasn't possible to arrange the cooperation, but the target remained unchanged.

There was just one way out: to step up the sale of aeroengines and use the revenue from that not to buy machine tools for retooling the engine-building plants, as envisaged from the very outset, but to buy automated lines for the production of agricultural equipment. And ANT fully lived up to our hopes: It quickly completed the necessary operations, sent the first batch of engines to the West, and ordered the equipment required. The effectiveness of the deal can be judged from two figures: For each ruble spent in the production of aeroengines we received $5-7. Bearing in mind the real rate of the ruble, that represented a profit of 10,000-15,000 percent!

But that is the economics of it. Now for the politics. Did we harm the country's defense capability? Of course not! But nevertheless, particular note should be made of the fact that the deal was authorized by the government.

Things went on from there. After our modern MiG-29 fighter was shown at Farnborough, where it made a great impression on Western specialists, Western firms asked ANT about acquiring these planes. The potential market was vast, running to hundreds of planes to the most diverse countries, including Western Europe. What answer should we give?

[Protsenko] I do not know. Obsolete engines are one thing, modern fighters are quite another. And Western Europe means NATO...

[Systsov] Well, that is the usual, non-specialist's view. Now let's discuss it. What equipment may be sold in the world market? No one is going to buy ancient goods. And even if we do manage to persuade someone to do so, we will be harming ourselves: By selling old-fashioned equipment we will not be able to modernize our plants because we are obliged to go on supplying the customer with spares for many years. The Americans, for instance, sell nothing but up-to-date equipment. In so doing they "lead" the market with them and can modernize production with ease.

Obviously, you cannot sell "tomorrow's equipment" either: Then there is a danger of really undermining the defense capability.

Therefore, you have to trade in today's mass-produced equipment. Even if this is speculative, there will be a spin-off for us: Well-organized production will give us quantitative advantages. Furthermore, each producer country has an "export version" of mass-produced equipment that it sells abroad...

[Protsenko] But is the MiG-29 a mass-produced machine?

[Systsov] Of course. And selling it in small quantities does not cause the country harm. What is more, we have already sold around 200 of them. Not to NATO members, admittedly, but everything in the world is relative: You will recall that at one time Egypt was one of our closest friends, and we exported quite a lot of weapons there, where they remained even when the situation changed.

But on the decision to sell the MiG-29, the fact that this was an "export" model was not our only consideration. I won't be revealing a great secret if I say that our country already has something better. That is why the Aviation Industry Ministry felt that this aircraft could and should be sold.

[Protsenko] Should? It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union is the world's largest weapons exporter. But this is hardly the kind of export to take pride in! Is there a demand?

[Systsov] There is. And you shouldn't think that if we suddenly stop supplying weapons abroad a general disarmament will begin. Our aircraft you will be replaced by U.S., French, or Israeli aircraft in our present partners' arsenals... There are many sellers. Military confrontation must be reduced by political methods—which is what our country is now doing.

So, we felt it possible to sell a consignment of MiG-29s to the West. We asked the government for permission. There was a conference involving the USSR Council of Ministers military-industrial commission, the Defense Ministry, the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and the Foreign Ministry. There were votes for and against and no decision was taken. Then the question was examined by the Politburo, which considered such a deal inexpedient at the present moment. We suspended our market research and all the preliminary negotiations. But before New Year I had a conversation with Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov. He also thought the sale possible.

You will doubtless remember the Central Television broadcast of Lev Nikolayevich's speech to the Mikoyan Experimental Design Bureau collective in February, when he said that we can and will sell these planes to any country, including those in the West.

Judge for yourself. A MiG-29 would be bought here for $20 million. Our miners are now demanding that the government grant them the right to sell 5 percent of the coal abroad to earn hard currency to meet their own needs. But the sale of one plane yields as much as the sale of 200,000 tonnes of coal. And if you sell 20 planes? How much gas, petrol, and gas will we leave in the ground?

In view of this I gave the requisite letters to Ryashenstev authorizing him on behalf of and on the instruction of the Aviation Industry Ministry to conduct negotiations regarding the sale of aviation equipment in the West and the purchase of equipment and consumer goods there that we need. To prevent any time being lost by the ANT, we here are for the moment deciding the question in principle.

The letter that now features in the press charges the Aviation Industry Ministry with "selling the homeland." But we had prepared ourselves to sell abroad only what the government would authorize!

[Protsenko] That was not, unfortunately, the case with the tanks. Why?

[Systsov] It's a very obscure business. I have already said that I see nothing wrong in the actual fact of the sale. But why do this "clandestinely"? There is a lot that is unclear here, and I hope that the enquiry will get to the bottom of it all. For some reason the safety mechanisms were not triggered. A senior military representative should have sounded the alarm. An order for a trainload cannot be executed without Ministry of Defense authorization. A trainload of tanks cannot be dispatched or move without a military escort. There was a whole heap of breaches which led to a huge uproar and discredited good work.

[Protsenko] Apollon Sergeyevich, perhaps the whole problem is that we have become accustomed to doing a very, very great number of things "by way of exception." It simply became ingrained in people's minds that, while there are rules which cannot be breached, there is no single rule which cannot be breached by way of exception. Particularly as the ANT itself was a huge "exception" to the general rule—the USSR Council of Ministers had given it enormous rights.

[Systsov] There's the rub. As you know, there does exist in the country a prescribed procedure for "nonstate foreign economic activity"—let us call it that. Any enterprise wishing to gain access to a foreign market has to obtain an export license for the product. And the license for the export of military equipment is naturally issued by the government.

But the point is that no licenses were needed at all by the ANT. The USSR Council of Ministers decision entitled it and its branches to export virtually any kind of materials, equipment, or goods without a license. In accordance with this decision a telegram was sent to the chief of the Main Customs Administration about the unlicensed export by the ANT of a very wide range of goods exempt from declaration. Not all our customs houses received that order. But look at the situation now: Strictly speaking, the ANT has breached nothing—it was given the right to sell without license the above-plan output of defense sectors, which it did.

[Protsenko] Do you not think that the the ANT was given privileges to protect it from bureaucracy?

[Systsov] I do. You can bury whomever and whatever you please under our mountain of paperwork. If ANT had applied for licenses in the normal way, it would have achieved nothing. But the tasks it was charged with were large.

What is the upshot, then? The investigation into the ANT case has only just started up, but the punishments have already piled up—expulsions from the party and dismissal. And yet the USSR Prosecutor's Office has not yet produced a defendant: An investigation of the "case" is under way, in which witnesses alone figure. I think that it should be the reverse in a rule-of-law state: investigation first, punishment second. And there is additionally all the irresponsible press ballyhoo. Do not get the idea that I am encroaching on glasnost or demanding a return to "restricted zones" and "restricted topics." But if the matter is so serious, then investigation must precede indictment...

[Protsenko] Here, I think, it is necessary to talk not just about tanks. The ANT is today charged with having sold off various materials which are needed within the country. And having thereby, it is alleged, weakened our economic power. Perhaps the established licensing procedure is the culprit here? When nothing can be sold without a license, a deal becomes possible only as a favor, as it were. Or by way of an exception. This eases the demagogues' task.

[Systsov] You are referring to those who declaim that we are fleecing the working class, are you not?

It has been said recently in the context of the "ANT expose" campaign that either some people are deliberately damaging the country, or the leadership contains people who are unaware of what they are doing. Believe me, we are aware. And no one has it in mind to sell off our homeland. The country today has surplus goods [nelikvidy] worth hundreds of billions of dollars. And surplus goods do not necessarily mean something completely unusable by us.

We are advancing with great effort, very inconsistently, but gradually toward a market economy. A situation where benefit is determined by actual profit is unusual and foreign to us. And not an abstract "statewide" profit, but one specific to an individual or a collective. And if someone needs something that someone else wants to sell abroad, let him offer a higher price or a mutually acceptable exchange. That was very quickly grasped by cooperative members—and cooperative enterprises are developing at a simply fantastic rate, despite all the obstacles. Now state enterprises too are beginning gradually to concern themselves with profit.

Therefore every new fact encountered in our life must be examined not from the standpoint of how it fits the dogmas of the command-administrative system but from the standpoint of common sense and progress toward a normal economy. Whatever this affects—the output of consumer goods, weapons manufacture, domestic trade, or foreign economic activity. The story of the ANT and its partners must also be regarded from this standpoint.

Incidentally, I can add that the winding up of the ANT has faced our ministry or, more precisely, our sector, with a number of difficult problems: Some deals have not been completed and the expected equipment for consumer goods production has not been received. I very much hope that the investigations being pursued by the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the USSR Supreme Soviet, which also has an interest in this affair, will produce their findings. We will then be able to draw conclusions as to whether what occurred was an unsuccesful form of transition to the new economy or the right path, a path which we should continue to follow.

Military

Statement Notes Baltic Opposition to Call-Up

LD3103144190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0600 GMT 31 Mar 90

Moscow, 31 Mar (TASS)—Here is a statement from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Defense:

"Another call-up to the Soviet Armed Forces is beginning. This is an event which directly affects millions of Soviet citizens, above all those young people who are to carry out their military service and, of course, the parents who are seeing off their sons. Naturally, labor collectives and educational establishments bidding farewell to recruits are also involved. The routine call-up to the Soviet Armed Forces is always an important, stirring, and festive event. The published decision of the USSR Council of Minsters on the discharge into the reserve of servicemen who have completed the designated period of service and the announcement of the April-June 1990 call-up launches, as it were, the spring call-up."

"But, unfortunately, there are grounds for concern and alarmn. In some places, in particular the Baltic Republics, a campaign aimed at wrecking the call-up has been underway for quite sometime. Legislation has even been passed contradicting the Constitution and other laws regulating call-up procedures and military service throughout the union. Various unofficial organizations, whose activities are intended to wreck the call-up, have joined in the campaign against the army. They have become considerably more active of late."

"For example, during a meeting organized by the Latvian Popular Front, the Geneva-49 society and other groupings in Riga's Cathedral Square on 29 March, calls were made for the surrender of military call-up cards and registration documents. Similar provocative acts are being carried out in other population centers. Unfortunately, as a result of this some conscripts are being encouraged to break the law and refuse to do their military service."

"In a statement on Republican television on 29 March the military commissar of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Maj-Gen A. Visotskis, rightly noted that military commissariats have been prevented from carrying out their duties. He appealed to the Supreme Soviet and the government of the Republic to reverse hasty decisions which encourage young people to violate the Soviet Constitution and to take steps to ensure that the call-up goes ahead successfully. This voice of reason should be heeded, especially as more and more people in the republic, including some Supreme Soviet deputies, are criticizing the completely unjustified haste with which these decisions were taken."

"In the Baltic republics attempts are being made to justify a boycott of army service by claiming that the 1949 Geneva Convention confers a right to refuse to serve in the Soviet army 'of occupation.' In this connection one should stress that a well-known trick of agents provocateurs and purveyors of false information is being played here—namely to cite some document or other as evidence, while keeping quiet about what it really says."

"The Geneva conventions on the protection of victims of war were indeed adopted in 1949. Article 51 of the convention 'On the protection of civilians in wartime' (and we stress the word 'wartime') forbids occupying powers to force the population of an occupied territory to serve in their armed forces or other auxiliary forces. Article 2 stipulates that the convention "is applicable in the event of a declaration of war or any other armed conflict."

"So, these conventions have nothing to do with the legal requirements governing the call-up of Soviet citizens for service in the USSR Armed Forces. To quote them as evidence is nothing other than an attempt to exploit ignorant people. This exploitation is all the more dangerous in that it could encourage a misguided person to break the law. Those who indulge in such provocative actions should have been brought to book long ago. We cannot allow the spring call-up to be upset in a single village or town. Every citizen must carry out his duty to the motherland."

Council of Ministers Directs Troop Draft

LD3003140290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] At the USSR Council of Ministers: Implementing the law on universal military service, the Council of Ministers has resolved to demobilize into the reserve in April-June servicemen on compulsory service, who have served the established period of active military service, from the Armed Forces of the USSR and from the border, internal and railway troops. In connection with demobilization into the reserve of servicemen on active military service in the Armed Forces of the USSR, in April-June, male citizens are being drafted who, by the day of the call-up, have turned 18 and who do not have the right to a deferral of conscription for active military service, and also citizens older than the age of conscription, who have lost the right to deferral of conscription. The decision will be published.

USSR Decides on New Military Conscription Law

Amendments Published

PM3003104190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

["USSR Law on Amendments to the USSR Law 'On Compulsory Military Service'" dated Moscow, the Kremlin, 28 March 1990]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

I. To make the following amendments to the USSR Law of 12 October 1967 on "Compulsory Military Service (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1967, No. 42, Article 552; 1980, No. 52, Article 1121):

1) The first part of Article 23 is to read as follows:

"Article 23. Citizens are drafted for active military service twice a year (May-June and November-December, and for troop units located in remote areas and certain other localities, furthermore, in April and October) in accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers resolution. The number of citizens liable to the draft is also established by the USSR Council of Ministers";

2) The first and second parts of Article 39 are to read as follows:

"Article 39. Servicemen who have completed their prescribed period of active military service are discharged into the reserve in accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers resolution.

"Soldiers, seamen, NCO's, and petty officers are discharged by the troop unit commander on the basis of the USSR Defense Ministry decree at the times specified by the USSR Council of Ministers resolution";

3) Article 104 is to read as follows:

"Article 104. The USSR defense minister's rights as provided by Articles 9, 12, 15, 39 (parts two and three), 40, 42, 44, 59, and 66 of the present Law are also granted correspondingly to the chairman of the USSR KGB and the USSR minister of internal affairs in respect of troops, institutions, and educational establishments under the jurisdiction of the USSR KGB and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

II. The present Law is to come into force from the moment of its adoption.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR.

Local Service Urged

PM3003122390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel P. Korytin, deputy commander for rear services of unnamed "unit": "Experiment Needed"]

[Text] On the question of what the Army should be like—professional, mercenary, or made up of conscripts—I support those who assert that our Army already consists of professionals. The question relates to the principle by which it is manned: Should it be hired or should it be drafted? But let us look at the problem from a slightly different angle.

Why not do it like this, for instance? Draft everyone, let us say, for six-eight months and teach everyone alike the basics of combined-arms combat. Properly, in training centers. And draft those who by force of circumstance are not able to carry out their service into backup units and subunits for two years. In that case both the Constitution and historical experience and the principle that everyone defends his home as far as possible would be observed. And apply the volunteer principle only to man units which will be involved in combat service. Then the latter really will be distinguished not by their numbers but by their skills.

For instance, as an alternative (to service in combat units) honor guard companies and ceremonial subunits could be created, paid for by the republic Supreme Soviets, which would reflect the national aspect. Beginning with the uniform and ending with the personnel. Some draftees could be left to do this, but again with a longer period of service. Add civil defense units to this, and the range of alternative service is no longer so narrow.

Further. In the last 10-15 years in the forces it has become fashionable to do everything: produce meat, grow vegetables, do construction work, harvesting, and so on. And all this is at the expense of combat training. But don't people realize that you can't do everything, that you have to study your own area professionally? So I believe that combat units must study combat tasks, and another system must back them up, possibly with different manning principles.

The essence of my proposal amounts to the following. All the rear subunits begin working according to a new system—a territorial system. Incidentally, this word is already in vogue among military economic managers. The okrug territory is divided into sections according to where the forces are stationed. The rear services bases—comprehensive, mobile, autonomous bases with direct ties both to local industry and also to central administrations—are formed according to the number of rayons. In each sector logistical and technical backup is determined by the backup facilities and a specific backup arrangement. A comprehensive module (platoon, company, battalion) is assigned to each facility, subordinate to a rear services base. The module's function includes comprehensive rear services backup of the unit or subunit, regardless of which particular branch of the Armed Forces or category of troops it belongs to.

A detailed definition of the proposed system is the subject for a separate discussion. But with this approach, in my view, the system of rear services backup will be simplified and its efficiency will be increased. An experiment is needed. We should be prepared to undertake both the practical and theoretical aspects.

Krivosheyev Interviewed

LD3103205190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Interview with Col. Gen. G.F. Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, by correspondent Oleg Bobin; at General Staff Headquarters on 31 March—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Bobin] Today the press has published a USSR Council of Ministers decision: On the discharge from the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces into the reserve of border guard, internal, and railway troop servicemen, and on the next draft of citizens to do active military service. Ordinarily, this would have come not as a decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, but as an order from the USSR minister of defense. So why the publication of a decision?

[Krivosheyev] The very fact that special amendments to the USSR law on general military service obligation had to be passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet before publication speaks volumes about the significance of this move, which marks a fresh approach toward the organization of the draft of citizens to do active military service and of the discharge into the reserve of servicemen doing compulsory military service.

The adoption of the new call-up and discharge procedure signifies that these actions have been placed on a genuinely legal and juridical footing in the wake of the changes that are taking place in the armed forces. Above all, the border guards, internal and railway troops—forces which are not subordinate to the defense minister—have been removed from the armed forces.

The publication of the USSR Council of Ministers decision provides a fresh stimulus for the invigoration and encouragement of the activity of the local soviet bodies, which, together with the military commissariats, are the main organisers of the call-up campaign, which is so laborious and complicated, particularly in the present-day conditions, and which involves thousands upon thousands of people. The USSR Council of Ministers decision is a sort of appeal to the good sense of the

Lithuanian leadership, Lithuanian servicmen who have deserted, and their parents. And finally the publication of the decision signifies a genuine attempt to boost the importance of military service and the perception of it as one's sacred duty to the motherland—in other words, to provide that which we have been so lacking, particularly of late.

Military Complains of 'Slanderous' Article

LD0104153890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] I don't think the staff of the journal OGONEK are in the mood for April Fool's Day jokes today. They have been criticised by a group of USSR people's deputies, mostly from the military, who have circulated a letter at the Supreme Soviet. Here is the view of a member of the Committee on Glasnost, Rights, and Citizen's Appeals, Anatoliy Stepanovich Yezhelev [also a member of the USSR Journalists Union]:

[Begin Yezhelev recording] The letter being circulated at the Supreme Soviet says that for a number of months OGONEK has been trying to discredit—to discredit, no more and no less—the Soviet Armed Forces, that it is trying to divide the officer corps into two opposing groups—the group of top Army and Navy commanders and the main body of officers. It claims that the journal is systematically blackening the name of Soviet generals and admirals. [sound of magazine pages being turned]

The journal does actually say that dachas are being built near Moscow for our top military officers and for the highest-ranking staff of the Ministry of Defense. It also says that this is going on in other places too, but the detailed account given here refers to the area near Moscow. Hundreds of thousands of rubles are being spent on the construction work, even though this has not been legally sanctioned.

The letter also complains that the results of these slanderous activities by OGONEK are such that they can only be compared with the consequences of the repressions to which the top military and political leaders of the Army and Navy were subjected in the thirties. [end recording]

Baltic Republics

Belorussia Demands Return of Lithuanian Territory

LD3003192990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1820 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Minsk, 30 Mar (BELTA-TASS)—The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has issued a statement addressed to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, that says:

"Those people in Lithuania who are trying to bring into force the Lithuanian Constitution of 12 May 1938 should take note of the fact that in 1938 the territory of the republic of Lithuania was quite different, and it is only as a result of the decisions of the supreme bodies of the USSR that the republic of Lithuania and the Lithuanian SSR were given what had, from time immemorial, been Belorussian territory. Should the Lithuanian SSR secede from the USSR, the Belorussian SSR will not consider itself bound by all the laws, decrees, and other deeds relating to the transfer to Lithuania of part of Belorussian land.

"The deeds relating to territorial issues beween the Belorussian SSR and the Lithuanian SSR were based on the USSR Supreme Soviet's law of 3 August 1940 'On Accepting the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Into the USSR,' which the Lithuanian side has now unilaterally declared invalid.

"By so doing, it assumes responsibility for the loss of force of Item 2 of this USSR Supreme Soviet Law of 3 August 1940, that relates to the transfer to the Lithuanian SSR of Sventsyanskiy Rayon and part of the territory of the Belorussian SSR's Vidzovskiy, Godutishkovskiy, Ostrovetskiy, Voronovskiy, and Radunskiy Rayons, and also for the loss of force of the relevant declaration by the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the decree adopted on the basis of this by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 6 November 1940 'On the Establishment of the Borders Between the Belorussian SSR and the Lithuanian SSR.'

"In the event of the Lithuanian SSR seceding from the USSR, the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet will be obliged to review its decisions on the administrative and territorial arrangement of the relevant oblasts of the Belorussian SSR which stem from the aforementioned deeds.

"Aside from that, in view of the statement by the Lithuanian authorities regarding their unwillingness to fully observe the 'Treaty on the Transfer to the Lithuanian Republic of the Town of Vilno and Vilno Oblast and on Mutual Assistance Between the Soviet Union and Lithuania,' concluded on 10 October 1939 between the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the president of the Lithuanian Republic, the question of the continued validity of the territorial changes in Lithuania's favor also arises.

"Among other things, this treaty affected the interests of the Belorussian population living in this territory, which was under Soviet jurisdiction from the second half of September 1939. It was concluded without the Belorussian SSR being informed and without its consent.

"Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the conclusion of this treaty stems from the secret accords associated with the Soviet-German nonaggression pact of 23 August 1939, which, as was stated in the decision of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies of 24 December 1989, was rendered invalid, under the provisions of international law, at the moment Germany attacked the USSR on 22 June 1941. The USSR People's Congress also condemned the signing of the 'secret supplementary protocol' to the treaty of 23 August 1939 and other secret accords with Germany. The Congress ruled the secret protocols to be legally untenable and invalid from the moment they were signed.

"In connection with the aforementioned, we shall be compelled to insist on the return of Belorussian lands to the Belorussian SSR," the statement says.

Lithuania Notes Demand

LD3103225590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] The neighboring republic of Belorussia has announced territorial claims to Lithuania in case Lithuania secedes from the Soviet Union. The statement, issued by the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet to the Lithuanian parliament, says that the territorial issues between Lithuania and Belorussia were based on the law of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 3 August 1940 on the admission of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, having declared one-sidedly that this law was invalid, the second item of the law has also become null and void. And this specific item is on the territories passed over to Lithuania by Belorussia. (?Thus) borders between Lithuania and Belorussia should be changed in favor of Belorussia.

The statement also makes allusion to the Soviet-Lithuanian agreement of 1939 on the return of Vilnius and the region of Vilnius back to Lithuania. The statement says that this agreement [word indistinct] upon the interests of the Belorussian people and it was signed without the official consent of Belorussia. As the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies has declared the secret protocols of the 1939 Soviet-Nazi agreement to be null and void, says the Belorussian statement, the following agreement on Vilnius is also invalid.

We'll be forced to demand the return of the Belorussian land to Belorussia. So ends the statement of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet to the Lithuanian parliament.

Lithuanian Spokesman Cited on Possible Referendum

LD3103170190 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1600 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Excerpts] We begin in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius. Our correspondent Vladislav Savic reports on new warnings by the military today.

[Savic] Slowly but surely the Soviet leadership is taking over buildings of importance in the Lithuanian society. [passage omitted]

Today there is again calm here in this conflict area. Both sides are trying to wear each other out. In the Vilnius streets there is no sign of the three-week long conflict between Vilnius and Moscow. New warnings came from the military, however. A high-ranking military official warned of tragic consequences today for the deserters who refuse to return to their units; this was stated by an office to a U.S. news agency.

At a news conference this afternoon President Vytautas Landsbergis was unusually restrained in his comments toward Moscow.

The government spokesman, Algimantas Chekuolis, declared before the news conference, however, that Lithuania might consider agreeing to Moscow's demand for a national referendum on the question of Lithuania's future. In that case, however, the result of the national referendum would apply at once; a five-year transition period would not be needed before Lithuania became independent, said Chekuolis, who reckons that more than 75 percent of the population wants an independent Lithuania.

Lithuania Asks Iceland To Host Talks

AU3103132890 Paris AFP in English 0111 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Reykjavik, March 31 (AFP)—The Lithuanian government has asked Iceland if it would be willing to host talks between Lithuania and Soviet officials on the Baltic republic's declaration of independence from the Soviet Union, the foreign ministry here said. In a statement Friday, the ministry said the request from Lithuanian leader Vytautas Landsbergis was made in a letter to Icelandic President Vigdis Finnbogadottir delivered to Iceland's ambassador in Norway by a delegation of members of the Lithuanian parliament.

Mr. Landsbergis thanked Iceland in the letter for its support for the Baltic republic's March 11 declaration of independence and asked if the Scandanavian nation would be willing to host possible talks aimed at resolving the crisis.

The Icelandic government responded favorably to the request, the foreign ministry said. Reykjavik hosted a summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in 1986.

Landsbergis Interviewed on Response to Gorbachev

TA0204054890 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0405 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Telephone interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Dan Eshel on 2 April; Landsbergis speaks in English with passage-by-passage Hebrew translation by Eshel—recorded]

[Text] [Eshel] In his reply to Mikhail Gorbachev, which will be sent this morning, President Vytautus Landsbergis announces that today the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet will continue to examine the possibilities of resolving the crisis with the Soviet Union. The letter, which will be sent this morning, is the Lithuanian Presidium's response to Gorbachev. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet will convene this morning, and President Landsbergis told me that within several days, Gorbachev will receive the response formulated by the full composition of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

I asked Lansbergis: Will you backtrack on your declaration of independence, as Gorbachev has demanded?

[Landsbergis] We cannot, because we have no mandate for doing so....

[Eshel] ....but we can discuss the problem in its entirety, including the link between ourselves and the Soviet Constitution. We must consult with the entire Lithuanian people on the issue of independence.

Vytautas Landsbergis was quoted yesterday as having described Gorbachev's letter as sharp and vindictive. During our conversation he softened his tone.

[Landsbergis] It is a wording and in some means it is also a proposition—a proposition for a dialogue.

[Eshel] The wording of the letter indeed constitutes a warning, but after careful perusal it seems to appeal for the opening of a dialogue. Landsbergis is not worried by the movements of Soviet military vehicles in his country.

[Landsbergis] These maneuvers of Soviet troops and tanks are abnormal, but we have no choice....

[Eshel] We can launch a dialogue. We suggested this long ago.

Meanwhile, in Israel, Georgiy Martirosov, the head of the Soviet representation here, expressed certainty that his president is doing everything possible regarding Lithuania.

[Martirosov, in English] Our government is making all possible, and Mr. Gorbachev especially, that we will find the come out of this situation.

Lithuanian Parliament To Examine Gorbachev Appeal

LD0104111890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1059 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 1 April (TASS)—The parliament of Lithuania will state its reaction to the USSR president's appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] after it has been examined at a session of the Supreme Soviet on Monday and Tuesday. This was reported today by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, in an interview on Lithuanian television. The president's appeal, he noted, has not yet been discussed at a sitting of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet presidium. However, Landsbergis said, "we cannot now be asked to revoke all that we have nurtured in our hearts."

"The president's statement seems fairly harsh to me," Romualdas Ozolas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers told a Lithuanian television correspondent. At the same time, he expressed satisfaction with the fact that Mikhail Gorbachev had not only made an appeal to the leadership of Lithuania but also to its people, which offers grounds for hope that the situation may be defused.

Landsbergis Claims Appeal Contains 'Open Threats'

LD3103222990 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] This evening Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, spoke on the Lithuanian TV news program commenting on the latest developments.

He said that he was acquainted with the contents of President Bush's letter addressed to Mikhail Gorbachev. President Bush, Mr. Landsbergis stated, clearly supports the Lithuanian nation's (?aspiration) for self-determination. Mr. Landsbergis also recalled Senator Edward Kennedy's message which he made clear in Moscow that if force was used in Lithuania the United States would react strongly.

Thus, against this background, Mr. Landsbergis noted, President Gorbachev's strongly worded appeal to the Lithuanian parliament is extremely surprising. Of course we will look into this matter when parliament convenes on either Monday or Tuesday, but otherwise, Mr. Landsbergis continued, Gorbachev's appeal contains an open [word indistinct] to revoke all that we have cherished in our hearts for decades and that we have [words indistinct] on 11 March. Only then (?if they) agree to meet with us to talk. But then there will be nothing to talk about, Mr. Landsbergis said.

According to the chairman of the Supreme Council, the appeal contains open threats as to the safety of the Lithuanian nation. There were also strange reproaches that we allegedly threatened the entire process of democratization in the Soviet Union. As far as I know, we have not sent paratroopers to the Soviet Union, nor are we doing any harm whatever to President Gorbachev's country, said Mr. Landsbergis.

We have already heard similar threats and appeals to the Lithuanian nation following the Baltic Way action last year, said Mr. Landsbergis. Holding hands then we knew that we had one common goal. Now we are moving toward it and we are being threatened again. Let us all join hands again, said in conclusion Mr. Landsbergis, on the late evening news show.

Reportage on Dismissal of Lithuanian Procurator

Offices Occupied

AU3003195190 Paris AFP in English 1926 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 30 (AFP)—Special troops of the Soviet Interior Ministry late Friday occupied the offices of Lithuania's chief public prosecutor, according to residents of Vilnius reached by telephone from Moscow.

The public prosecutor of the Soviet Union had earlier Friday dismissed the top Lithuanian legal official, Arinas Paulauskas, who had been appointed last week by the new Lithuanian leader, Vytautus Landsbergis. The Soviet public prosecutor named Antanas Petrauskas, formerly the Lithuanian military prosecutor to the post, saying that Mr. Paulauskas's appointment had been illegal.

Paulauskas Dismissed

LD3003211990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Report by Correspondent P. Orlov in Lithuania—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Orlov] The most tense area of Vilnius today is at the Lithuanian Procurate. Staff of town and district procurates have gathered here to meet Aleksey Dmitriyevich Vasilyev, USSR first deputy procurator-general.

[Vasilyev] I have come here on behalf of the USSR Procurator- General to notify the members of the Procurate of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of an order issued by the Procurator- General. As you know, on 22 March the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, in violation of the USSR Constitution, appointed a procurator of the Lithuanian Republic. This is the sole prerogative of the USSR Procurator-General, as the head of the unified, centralized prosecution service in our country.

Therefore, by order of the USSR Procurator-General, dated 29 March 1990, Paulauskas, the former first deputy procurator of the Lithuanian SSR, who was appointed procurator of the republic by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, in violation of the Constitution, has been removed from his post—from the post of first deputy procurator. He has also been dismissed from the organs of the procurate for flagrant violation of Articles 166-168 of the Constitution, and Article 7 of the Law on the Procuratorate.

[Orlov] The new procurator, Antanas Petrauskas, also had a hard time today. He used to be military prosecutor of the Riga garrison. There were a number of questions. How do you envisage working with the staff of the procurate now? And what will you do if an alternative prosecution service develops in the republic? Motieka, a deputy in the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, was even blunter. He announced, in particular, that in accordance with a decision adopted today by the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers, the Lithuanian procurate will be financed by the republic, not by the union, as from next week.

Such is the situation today within a body which is supposed to ensure adherence to legality in the republic. In leaving the procurate, we noted this announcement about the surrender of party cards. By a decision of the Supreme Soviet, the republic's procurate is being depoliticized.

Further on Procurator Controversy

LD3103141190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Two high-ranking officials from the Soviet Procurator's Office have arrived today [30 March] in Lithuania. One of them is Aleksey Vasilyev, first deputy of the general procurator, and the second is Yuriy Shadrin, member of the board of the Soviet Procurator's Office.

They have brought to Vilnius four orders issued by the general procurator of the Soviet Union. According to these orders Arturas Paulauskas, procurator of Lithuania, is relieved from his post.

I would like to remind you at this point that Moscow persistently continues to maintain that the Procurator's Office of Lithuania is subordinated to that of the Soviet Union and must abide by the Soviet Constitution. Thus, Moscow has appointed Antanas Petrauskas first deputy procurator of Lithuania and acting procurator of Lithuania, as the former Procurator Vidutis Barauskas is ill. Up till now Antanas Petrauskas was procurator of the Riga military garrison.

The first meeting of the guests from Moscow with the staff of the Procurator's Office of Lithuania was very short, it lasted for only half an hour. Egidijus Bickauskas, a MP, [member of parliament] spoke on behalf of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Parliament and expressed regret that officials from the Soviet Procurator's Office did not realize the need to resolve the present political situation in Lithuania by political means only. The orders issued by the Soviet general procurator in respect to Lithuania are nothing but meddling in the affairs of a foreign state and have no juridical force whatsoever.

After the speech made by Egidijus Bickauskas, an estimated 100 officials of the Lithuanian Procurator's Office left the meeting hall as a sign of protest. Thirteen officials remained, among them 10 from the Soviet Procurator's Office who are now visiting Lithuania.

The second meeting in the Procurator's Office of Lithuania was held in the afternoon today, but this time the procurators of the Lithuanian regions and cities were acquainted with the orders mentioned before. The scenario was identical to that of the morning meeting, and the reaction of the procurators was identical too.

The Moscow officials maintained tiresomely that the Soviet Constitution is valid in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Indeed, a dialogue between a blind man and a deaf one is practically impossible.

Antanas Petrauskas demonstrated his loyalty to Moscow in a short radio interview.

Arturas Paulauskas was received with a lasting ovation. He said that now everyone should decide whom to side with—Lithuania or the Soviet Union. False reports on the increasing crime in Lithuanian were denied. According to Arturas Paulauskas, the reasons for the present political tension here in Lithuania should be looked for outside the boundaries of Lithuania. Mr. Paulauskas said that Moscow aims to further destabilize the situation in Lithuania by creating an alternate procurator's service here.

The absolute majority of the procurators participating at the meeting firmly supported this stand.

The next to speak was Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania and a lawyer by profession. He said the time has ended when we had to obey Moscow's ultimate orders without considering our own wishes. He noted that Arturas Paulauskas will continue to act as the procurator of Lithuania as he was appointed to this post by the Lithuanian parliament.

Financing from Moscow will be cut on Monday. However, the staff of the Lithuanian Procurator's Office are going to receive the same pay from the republican budget.

Egidijus Bickauskas called on Aleksey Vasilyev to change the aim of his arrival and begin representing the Soviet Union in starting talks between Lithuania and the Soviet Union at the procurators level. Aleksey Vasilyev did not dare to undertake this role, however he agreed to participate in the meeting of the Presidium of the Lithuanian parliament.

Afterward a news conference took place, and once again absurd accusations were made in respect to the so-called illegal appointment of the procurator of Lithuania. The Soviet Constitution was cited over and over again. However Aleksey Vasilyev evaded giving direct answers, saying that he was not a politician but an official of the Soviet Procurator's Office acting on the orders of the Soviet general procurator.

At the end of the news conference Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, said that it was impossible to violate a Constitution that was null and void here in Lithuania. The aim of the visit to Lithuania of the high ranking Moscow officials was clear enough, said Vytautas Landsbergis. It was the destruction of the existing system of law and order. The Soviet Army has already soiled its name here in Lithuania. Are the bodies of Soviet law and order willing to do the same?, asked Mr Vytautas Landsbergis.

The "Vremya" news program broadcast by the Soviet television network continued today to maintain the lies spread by Moscow about Lithuania.

Lithuanian Law on Procuracy Changed

90UN1101D Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 21 Feb 90 p 1

[Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Law on Amendments and Supplements to Chapter 18 of the Lithuanian Constitution (Basic Law) published under the rubric: "Documents Adopted at the 17th Session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation]

[Text] The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet **decrees** that Chapter 18 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution (Basic Law) be changed to the following wording:

"Chapter 18. The Procuracy.

"Article 162. The Lithuanian SSR procurator and the procurators subordinate to him exercise the highest supervision over the exact and uniform execution of the laws by ministries, state committees and departments, enterprises, institutions and organizations, administrative organs of the local soviets of people's deputies, collective farms, cooperative and other social organizations, social movements, officials, and citizens on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR.

"Article 163. At the recommendation of the chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Lithuanian SSR procurator is appointed by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and is responsible and accountable to it.

"Article 164. Lithuanian SSR deputy procurators are appointed by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet at the recommendation of the procurator of the republic.

"Rayon, city, and other procurators are appointed by the Lithuanian SSR procurator.

"Article 165. The term of office for the Lithuanian SSR procurator, his deputies, and all the subordinate procurators is five years.

"Article 166. The organs of the Lithuanian SSR Procuracy exercise their power independent of any organs of state administration and self-government and are subordinate only to the Lithuanian SSR procurator."

[Signed] A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic;

L. Sabutis, secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic

[Dated]Vilnius, 13 February 1990

Lithuania Voids USSR Law on Procurator

90UN1101E Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 21 Feb 90 p 1

[Decree of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on the Suspension of the Rules of the USSR Law of 30 November 1979 "On the USSR Procuracy" That Contradict the Statutes of Chapter 18 of the Lithuanian Constitution published under the rubric: "Documents Adopted at the 17th Session of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation"]

[Text] Guided by Article 70 of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution (Basic Law), the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet **decrees:**

That the rules of the USSR Law of 30 November 1979 "On the USSR Procuracy" which contradict the Lithuanian SSR Constitution be suspended.

[Signed] A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR;

L. Sabutis, secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR

[Dated] Vilnius, 13 February 1990

Procurator's Office, History Institute Occupied

LD3003221190 Vilnius International Service in English 2100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Excerpts] We start the Lithuanian news with the latest and perhaps the most alarming item.

This evening, at about 2130, two more public buildings were seized in the Lithuanian capital Vilnius. They are the Lithuanian Procurator's Office and the History Institute of the Lithuanian Communist Party, together with its archives.

The procurator's office was occupied by a group of Internal Army Soldiers who were helped by one of the officials of the procurator's office. [passage omitted]

The Party History Institute with its archives was also taken over by the Internal Army troops.

Report on Troops in Press Building

LD3103103690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 31 Mar 90

[From the "Lithuania Today" program presented by editor Dora Petkauskaite]

[Text] My colleagues who were on duty last night heard a lot about various events. People were asking them whether there was any danger to the Lithuanian House of the Press and to the printing works in Vilnius. Colleagues on duty in the Ministry of Internal Affairs reassured everyone that everything was quiet, nothing was different, and this morning we all found all the newspapers at the kiosks.

However, we heard on the television this morning reports from the Sajudis Information Agency that the House of Press was being guarded, they even have the designator of the military unit.

When I talked to Mecislovas Atroskevicius on duty at the Ministry of Internal Affairs at 1100, he said that Lithuania's militiamen were discharging their duties; as to what was happening at the House of the Press, he said they had no influence.

There was no other way but to go to the House of the Press. There, roughly one hour ago, I saw at the entrance to the printing works a covered truck with an inscription reading militia with people inside, their numbers were Lithuanian. And what I said and heard when I opened the door to the printing works has been recorded:

[Begin recording] [Petkauskaite] Good morning, I say it to two militiamen whom I met at the entrance to the printing works. As you can hear, they are maintaining contact with their superiors. [indistinct noise] militiamen are apologizing. When you came to work this morning did you have increased protection? And is there no explanation?

[Unidentified speaker] I know nothing. I found it like this.

[Petkauskaite] You are on duty, in this House. [Petkauskaite begins speaking in Russian] However, you don't speak like someone on duty. But just talk to people, comrade senior lieutenant. Since you approached me at my request, then you will agree to say a few words, at least how long have you been here?

[Unidentified speaker in Russian] [words indistinct]

[Petauskaite in Russian] Since last night. How do you think the information appeared on Lithuanian television that the House of the Press has been occupied by a military unit?

[Unidentified speaker in Russian] People do not understand. They saw uniformed people and for some reason decided that they were military.

[Petkauskaite in Russian] Who ordered you here?

[Unidentified speaker in Russian] [words indistinct]

[Petkauskaite in Russian] Lithuanian militia or the militia of the Soviet Union?

[Unidentified speaker in Russian] [words indistinct]

[Petkauskaite] The TIESA observer Vilius Kavaliauskas is coming, apparently driven by anxiety.

[Kavaliauskas] I have heard that my editorial office is also being guarded. Why? I think there is no logic in these actions by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. For instance, why do they guard the Spalis Rayon committee? Nobody has done anything to that committee. I think that this is the enthusiastic initiative of some officials of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs who have come here. Wishing to justify the stern Gorbachev's order, they have ordered the occupying of this....

[Petkauskaite, interrupting] And the new law on the use of internal troops?

[Kavaliauskas] It seems to me that they used them before this law was adopted. It is published only today in IZVESTIYA, and all these actions started here much earlier. This is a purely political gesture having nothing in common with either unrest or law and order, because if they solve internal party quarrels with the support of the army, only the devil knows what will happen. The same applies to the problem of the procuracy. This is a purely political quarrel over which constitution is valid in Lithuania and it is stupid to solve it with the aid of soldiers wearing militia uniforms.

[Petkauskaaite] Perhaps it is fortunate that these soldiers are very modest, one of them is walking supporting himself with a stick.

[Kavaliauskas] We must understand them. They are simple soldiers called up to the army during the extraordinary call-up and sent to the internal troops instead of to normal units. They have their orders which they carry out. I understand this. This is a political solution, a political order which is at present being applied in Lithuania. [end recording]

Landsbergis Refuses To Renounce Achievements

LD0104104990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] USSR President M. Gorbachev, told the government of Lithuania that the decisions adopted at the legislature's first session should be repealed. He called the decisions anticonstitutional and a threat to the citizens of Lithuania.

According to him, the separation of Lithuania and the violation of the Constitution could have very grave consequences.

Otherwise, he is prepared to start a dialogue on issues about which both sides are interested, within the framework of the USSR Constitution.

The opinion of Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, is firm: Lithuania is not threatening anyone and force is not being used against its citizens. People are safe in Lithuania. Lithuania will not renounce what she has achieved at last after 50 years of occupation.

Arrival of 'Military Equipment' Seen in Vilnius

LD0104130190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] We received a phone call from a radio listener in the Naujininkai residential area to tell us that a large column of military vehicles is moving from the airport in the direction of the center of Vilnius. About 1300 local time we could see with our own eyes how right she was: 13 armored vehicles moving along F. Zemaitis and K. Pozela Streets passed the buildings of Vilnius Radio and Television.

According to information from our journalist colleagues a great amount of military equipment was transported on open railway cars into Vilnius last night. Later, this equipment was unloaded at the Vilnius garrison.

Military maneuvers are in progress.

The USSR KGB declared that it would continue to carry out its functions in Lithuania, in particular in the fight against crime and in exposing the activities of foreign intelligence services.

Troop Movements Reported on Lithuanian Seacoast

LD0104151590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Telephone report by Antanas Lauraitis "from the seaside" of Lithuania—recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] People in Lithuania voice their protests against acts of vandalism committed by Soviet troops in small towns and cities of the republic of Lithuania, as well as in medical institutions. This concern was voiced by people from the seaside area in their telegrams to USSR President Gorbachev and Minister of Defense D. Yazov.

Unfortunately, airborne troops and marine combat troops carry on. Last night a column of armored vehicles yet again passed through Silute toward Klaipeda. An especially disturbing situation is in Panemune, several kilometers from Pagegiai. As we know, the land on the other side of the Nemunas River is called the Kaliningrad Oblast. The military armored vehicles are prepared to immediately block the road on the bridge across the Nemunas River. Soviet soldiers check the identity documents of people travelling on buses or cars.

This morning we did not manage to cross the bridge on the Nemunas River leading to Sovietsk, where we wanted to get material for our program on Vydunas [a Lithuanian poet and thinker]. [passage omitted]

We were not convinced that here in Panemune the Soviet troops are stationed to check if young men were deserting the Soviet Armed Forces. Even less convincing were the explanations that the movements of airborne troops on the territory of the republic are maneuvers.

You will agree that it is very disturbing and annoying to see and hear such maneuvers in the seaside area of the republic, which have now been going on for the second week.

Reporter Finds No 'Paratroopers' in Vilnius

LD3103182590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer Yevgeniy Kiselev] Our special correspondent's report from Lithuania:

[Correspondent Valentin Dvinin, standing outside the entrance to a building] Since this morning Vilnius has been agitated by rumors which have been strongly encouraged by Western radio stations, to the effect that paratrooper detachments have, allegedly, occupied—or seized, even—the offices of the Lithuanian Procuratorate. We arrived here [video shows sign in Lithuanian with words: Lithuanian Procuratorate] at 0945 local time. We did not see any paratroopers here. Today is Saturday. The Procuratorate is closed. Nevertheless, we shall try to get inside the building and find out who is guarding it. [video shows Dvinin approaching the door, addressing two men in blue militia uniform] Open up please. Open up please. We are from the "Vremya" program. Who are you representing here?

[First militiaman] We are representing the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

[Dvinin] The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs?

[First militiaman] Of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

[Dvinin] Of the Lithuanian SSR—is that right?

[First militiaman] Yes.

[Dvinin] And who normally guards this building?

[First militiaman] It is normally guarded by the Ministry of Internal Afairs of the Lithuanian SSR.

[Dvinin] Just like today?

[First militiaman] Just like today, just like always. [video shows second militiaman displaying his Lithuanian MVD identity card]

[Dvinin] A reporter for the Japanese KYODO news agency was also able to see this for himself.

[Unidentified Japanese reporter addresses second militiaman] How many militiaman are there inside at the moment?

[Second militiaman] There are three. Him, him, and him. [video shows sign above doorway, saying: Vilnius Higher Party School. Dvinin talks to a militiaman at the door]

[Dvinin] We did not even see paratroopers in the places where they were on duty only yesterday. A spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, Colonel Arshinevskiy, officially confirmed this for us.

[Arshinevskiy] Last night, the responsibility for guarding all buildings, which had earlier been guarded by Soviet Army detachments, including paratroopers, was handed over to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. [passage omitted: report on a meeting of the Lithuanian Komsomol]

'Excursion' by Troops to TV Tower Reported

LD3103103790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 31 Mar 90

[From the "Lithuania Today" program presented by editor Dora Petkauskaite; read in Lithuanian followed by a repeat in Russian]

[Text] Yet another topic of your telephone calls is the possible excursion by airborne troops to the television tower in Vilnius which has been promised for this evening.

We have been informed by the Lithuanian Ministry of Communications that excursions to the Lithuanian Radio and Television Broadcasting Center are temporarily suspended for technical reasons.

Bickauskas Appointed Representative, Wants Talks

LD3103095290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] The Lithuanian government made a significant decision today which, one may hope, will break the deadlock on the problem of negotiations with Moscow. The Lithuanian Council of Ministers has appointed member of the Supreme Council Presidium, lawyer Egidijus Bickauskas, to the post of permanenent representative of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers at the USSR Council of Ministers. Egidijus Bickauskas has been appointed in place of Stanislavs Jarosevicius who retired.

It was Egidijus Bickauskas who was authorized to present to the Third Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow the document of the Lithuanian Supreme Council on the restoration of independent Lithuania to Mikhail Gorbachev. During the presentation of the document Mikhail Gorbachev asked Egidijus Bickauskas whether he would not agree to be the ambassador of the Lithuanian Republic in Moscow. It was expected at that time that Moscow was thinking, without advertising itself, about negotiations with Lithuania and the establishment of new relations between both states. A few days later Egidijus Bickaukas and Prof. Vaidotas Antanaitis presented to USSR president Mikhail Gorbachev a reply from the Lithuanian Supreme Council to the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies on Lithuania. Then Mikhail Gorbachev conversed with Lithuania's representatives for almost half an hour and, as Egidijus Bickauskas informed Vilnius radio at that time, that conversation allowed one to draw the conclusion that this was not to be the last conversation. Yesterday, having returned from Moscow, Egidijus Bickauskas stated at a news conference that the USSR President had not answered his two requests to be received for talks.

Today's appointment of Egidijus Bickauskas to the post of the permanent representative in Moscow is a logical continuation of Lithuanian Government actions to initiate negotiations with Moscow. One may hope that the official representative will at least receive an official reply.

Military Prosecutor on Lithuanian Deserters

LD3003214990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Interview with Lt. Gen. Aleksandr Filippovich Katusev, chief military prosecutor and USSR deputy procurator-general, by Oleg Bobin on 30 March; place not given—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Bobin] There have been very contradictory articles in certain publications about the events in Lithuania. For example, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, quoting TASS, writes that the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Defense has decided not to prosecute servicemen of Lithuanian nationality. At the same time, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, quoting the Ministry of Defense press center, says that the Military Procuratorate has initiated criminal proceedings in every case of desertion.

Aleksandr Filippovich, it is only natural to ask this question of you, as the chief military prosecutor. What is the position of the Military Procuratorate on this question?

[Katusev] There was an inaccuracy in the TASS statement that was broadcast yesterday on Radio Mayak and on the Vremya television news and published in some of today's newspapers. Under the law, the Ministry of Defense is not authorized to make decisions on dropping proceedings against offenders. This is the prerogative of the Procuratorate and the courts. I state here quite authoritatively that the Military Procuratorate has initiated criminal proceedings in every case of desertion by servicemen—and not just those of Lithuanian nationality, but others as well. This is necessary in order to determine the circumstances of the offenses committed, the motive for them, and contributory factor.

At the same time, mitigating circumstances envisaged by the law—including an honest confession, giving oneself up, being influenced or forced to commit a crime by others, under threat, and so on—will be taken into consideration when the question of penalties for refusing to carry out service is decided.

I must also make it clear to everyone that the longer a serviceman refuses to carry out military service, the worse his situation becomes. We will also prosecute those civilians who incite servicemen to boycott military service. Soviet laws operate throughout the territory of the USSR. We will carry them out and strive to ensure that all citizens, organizations, and departments do so too until such time as they are repealed.

[Bobin] Aleksandr Filippovich, how large-scale is this problem How many criminal cases are there?

[Katusev] There are over 1,000 of these cases today.

[Bobin] There have now been cases of deserters being returned to their units by military contingents in the republic. Is such action legal?

[Katusev] All this is being done in accordance with existing legislation. The Ministry of Defense is obliged to detain persons who refuse to carry out military service. It must deliver them to military estabishments, where the question of proceedings will eventually be decided.

Arrests of Lithuanian Deserters To Continue

PM3003160190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Ministry Press Center report under the general heading "On the Situation in Lithuania": "What Is Behind the Mask?"]

[Text] "Aggression," "punitive action...." These are far from being the "strongest" expressions that can be heard from the leaders of "Sajudis" in Lithuania today. What is being spoken of with such theatrical passion, and in what connection is a farce played out in a 30-minute broadcast on republican television? Passions are being fueled in connection with a paratroop operation to arrest deserters taking refuge, in particular, in a mental hospital.

The logic of such "benefactors" is strange, to say the least. They provoke young people into crimes that entail criminal liability, while describing as aggressors and goons those who help to suppress illegal steps, thereby acting also in the interests of the very servicemen who have gone AWOL from their units.

All the arrested deserters have been returned to their units. The Army command intends to take similar action in the future too. The Military Prosecutor's Office has instituted criminal proceedings on each instance of desertion.

It is impossible not to voice regret in connection with the position of the republic's law-enforcement organs, which are not only failing to take measures to prevent desertion but also frequently helping to conceal persons who have violated the law and the military oath.

Numerous instances of pressure on servicemen's parents have been noted in the republic. They are invited to "Sajudis" strongpoints, where they are given specific "recommendations" on persuading their sons to desert. Provocative letters and telegrams are sent to the command of military units, notably in the name of parents.

Of course, in this complex situation a considerable section of the population finds itself prey to emotions. At the same time there are instances where reason prevails and people begin to understand that the separatists are working to sow enmity and discord. Thus, in Kaunas the parents of 6 weak-willed servicemen asked the command to help their sons return to their place of service. The request was met. Naturally, when the investigation is conducted, a guilty plea will be regarded as a mitigating circumstance.

The leaders of "Sajudis" are not averse to advertising themselves as ardent patrons of humanism and democracy. But the events of recent days leave no doubts that this is just a mask. And it is not only a matter of devotion to "strong" expressions. Here is just one fact: On the eve of a rally organized by the republic's progressive forces in Vilnius 27 March, in which servicemen of the garrison also participated, the republic radio and television warned that its participants would be photographed by employees of law-enforcement organs with a view to subsequently instituting proceedings against them as enemies of the Lithuanian State.

"Democracy" of this kind allows both direct violence and hooligan actions against servicemen. In Panevezhis, extremists made an attempt to draw into a conflict guard personnel returning to the military camp after carrying out service.

The fueling of anti-Army sentiments, the fanning of the "aggression" topic in the mass media, the intimidation of the population with possible "bloody" terror on the part of Soviet Army units—all these are links in the same chain of actions by separatist forces.

Lithuanian Ministry Views Building Occupation

LD3103224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] As we have already reported in yesterday's broadcast, Soviet Interior Ministry troops took hold of the Chief Procurator's Office of Lithuania and the Institute of the Lithuanian Communist Party History, together with its archives.

The Soviet Television network once again misinformed its viewers about these events, saying that the Procurator's Office was controlled by the staff of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry.

The Interior Ministry of Lithuania has made an official statement saying that its staff did not participate in the actions against the Procurator's Office. It was occupied by a unit of Soviet Interior Ministry troops, and at present they control the situation here.

[words indistinct] of security staff of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry [words indistinct] the property of the Procurator's Office. Professor [name indistinct], head of the Party History Institute, is especially concerned about the possible destruction of the institute's archives.

Lithuanian Organs Refuse To Surrender Firearms

PM3103171290 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 1

[Special correspondent S. Doronin report: "Lithuania: Who Has the Weapons"]

[Text] Vilnius—The seven-day period during which USSR citizens living in Lithuanian territory were instructed to hand over their firearms for temporary safekeeping has expired. Nonetheless the USSR president's decree of 21 March 1990 "On Additional Measures To Safeguard the Rights of Soviet Citizens and Protect the Sovereignty of the USSR in the Territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic" has not been fulfilled in the republic. The failure to fulfill it is emphatically deliberate, since, in the view of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis, the "directives of the president of another state" can simply be ignored.

So what is the situation regarding weapons in the possession of private individuals and organizations?

In all, there are estimated to be more than 40,000 weapons in Lithuania. Sporting, combat, or hunting weapons; given the existing situation in Lithuania they could cause considerable trouble.

It would appear to be self-evident that the measure proposed by the USSR president's decree does not infringe anyone's rights. On the contrary, it protects them. The only thing that is unclear is why the republic's leadership felt the need to whip up passions over the question of the surrender and confiscation of weapons, to instruct people on how to act if "uninvited guests" arrive (meaning representatives of the Army) or, for instance, try to break into your home and carry out a search or something of that kind, and to give people the right to decide for themselves whether or not to hand over their weapons for safekeeping. Incidentally, Landsbergis' recommendations are rather original: to record every such visit and its results—who came, on what day, at what time, and how it ended.

This is what Colonel A. Aksenov, a spokesman for the USSR Defense Ministry Main Rocket and Artillery Directorate, told me about the progress of the surrender of firearms:

"As of today, according to figures from the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1,487 hunting rifles have been handed in. We are keeping 290 of them. In all there are 29,000 hunting rifles in the republic. Combat weapons that were in the possession of the military faculties of higher educational establishments have been confiscated entirely. Approximately one-half of the sporting firearms have been received from DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] organizations. Collection points, our troop units' stores, and storage sites were specified. Citizens are guaranteed the return of their weapons when the situation permits."

It emerged during our talk that the republican internal affairs organs, which were instructed by the presidential decree to hand over confiscated weapons to the USSR Defense Ministry, did not do this—they kept them. The reasoning is as follows: On 28 March the government of the Lithuanian Republic adopted a resolution on the safekeeping of hunting and sporting weapons, which is supposed to defend the population against the supposed threat of forcible confiscation of Lithuanian citizens' property by the Armed Forces. According to this resolution, internal affairs departments are to guarantee that all weapons accepted are kept safely, not removed from Lithuania, and returned once the danger of confiscation is over.

So it transpires that thousands of guns are in different departments: some fulfilling the USSR president's decree, some under the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian government.

Lithuanian Troops Urged To Keep Service Oath

LD3103195590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Events on Lithuanian soil are not developing simply. The concern of those young men conscripted into the Army from the republic is therefore fully understandable. They are awaiting news from their homeland with hope and alarm. Our correspondent Vladimir (Stanovskiy) attended a meeting between staff of the permanent representation of Lithuanian at the USSR Council of Ministers and construction troops from the units of the Moscow regions. Listen to his report:

[Stanovskiy] [passage omitted] It was opened by Colonel Valeriy Vaghanovich (Aganov), head of the Political Department of the Main Directorate of the Construction Industry of the USSR Minisry of Defense.

[Aganov] What is the objective of this meeting? There is just one objective here, comrades, how we are to make as few mistakes as possible today. What's more, it is a reciprocal objective. We would like to make as few mistakes as possible in mutual relations and that you, too, should make fewer mistakes on the basis of the social and political situation that has come into being today. Allow me to hand over to Comrade Robertas Juozasovich (Verbitskas), first deputy at the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's [SSR] representation at the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Verbitskas, alternating in Lithuanian and Russian] Greetings Lithuanian [word indistinct]. I will first read you the appeal from the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania in Lithuanian.

An appeal from the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic to those citizens of the Lithuanian Republic serving in the USSR Armed Forces. Today I would like to appeal to you, the servicemen conscripted from Lithuania for service with the Soviet Army. Obviously, you have all already taken the oath to serve the Soviet Union loyally under the Constitution of our common homeland. The leadership has a high opinion of Lithuanian servicemen. I often have meetings in troop units and make speeches from various rostrums. [passage omitted]

Once again, I'd like to ask you to be conscientious and to serve well until your issues are sorted out: either until your service comes to an end or the issues of the governments are resolved. Be sensible. I wish you great success in your service, military and political training and in your work as builders. Building is the most peaceful profession and one that makes a great contribution to improving the lifes of all Soviet people, including that of your own republic.

[Stanovskiy] Comrade Verbitskas answered numerous questions, some of which were fairly trenchant, such as this:

[Verbitskiy] What should I do if I believe that I am obliged to serve in an Army of occupation? I do not think that is what we should call the srvicemen of the Soviet Army who are now on Lithuanian territory, for those young men currently serving are just like yourselves. They are not an occupying force. That's rot what you call yourselves. And don't say others are. [passage omitted]

[Stanovskiy] Colonel (Bobrynev) a representative of the Main Military Procuracy of the USSR, spoke at the meeting.

[Bobrynev] Questions have been asked here as to what laws to live and serve by, and so on. These are the USSR Constitution, the USSR law on Universal Military Service: as you know, no one has repealed this. You are a part of the Armed Forces of the USSR. The question has also been asked about attitudes to desertion, whether to leave a military unit or not. I have to explain the following, comrades. Why should we swell the ranks of the criminal world by spontaneously abandoning a unit, deserting illegally etc.? There is absolutely no need for this. [passage omitted]

Commissar Says Lithuanians Returning To Service

LD3103091190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0732 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, 31 March—A special TASS correspondent reports: Lutskus Vatslovas, who works at the animal husbandry unit of the "Bartinenkay" collective farm brought his nephew, Private Audryus Skrinskas who left his military unit without leave, to the republican military registration and enlistment office of Lithuania. Vatslovas decided to personally accompany the young man to his place of service. The young man is worrying that he committed an ill- considered act.

"During the last few days the parents of 20 deserters have been at our office," N. Rogachev, deputy military commissar of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, says. "I have already received four this morning. I will not name names. Some citizens may be subjected to very harsh pressure by those forces in the republic whose purpose will be served by any conflict. You know that separatists especially are whipping up such conflicts."

What do the parents say when returning their sons to military service? They regret above all that they did not succeed in warning their boys in good time against this dangerous step. They are annoyed with the politcos who have drawn Lithuanian servicemen into an unworthy game.

As the deputy military commissar reported, dozens of deserters have not yet stated their intention to voluntarily rectify their mistake. "Public opinion which is being artificially whipped up around them is a serious destabilizing factor. I am not even taking it upon myself to predict all its consequences," he said.

Prunskiene Discusses Military Order

LD3103133190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene by unidentified reporter, place, date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Reporter] Today's newspapers carry an order by the chairman of the Council of Ministers, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov on the call-up to military service and release from it. Your comments, please.

[Prunskiene] Yes, we regard that this is one of the most complex and most basic topics in the negotiations between the governments of the republic and of the Soviet Union, because the call-up and direct duty of our young people to go to the army is at present [passage indistinct], and this is a problem of the Lithuanian republic, its Supreme Council and the government. Therefore we are taking up this problem and will on Monday [2 April] render the talks more active through our new representative directly in order to solve this in a completely new version [word indistinct] independence of the republic.

Council Issues Statement on Military Service

LD0104142290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Some documents were adopted yesterday at a sitting of the Supreme Council Presidium which lasted late into the night.

Here is a statement adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium:

The administration of the Soviet Union is intending to begin the recruitment of young men into the Soviet Armed Forces, which is illegal on the territory of the republic of Lithuania. By doing this, the Soviet Union violates the Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Convention of 1949, which the Soviet Union also signed, violates universally recognized human rights, aggressively tramples over the sovereignty of Lithuania and ignores and violates the laws of Lithuania.

The republic of Lithuania has no other means to protect her citizens from this violence other than appealing to international organizations and the people of the world to ask the USSR once again to start negotiations on the whole issue of relations or on specific issues: the status of the armed forces, military service, and other specific problems.

The government of the republic of Lithuania, assessing the above circumstances, does not forbid Lithuanian citizens from doing military service in the Armed Forces of an alien country; they should not be reproached—an oath given under compulsion does not bind these young men.

The republic of Lithuania has been trying and will carry on trying by all possible means and ways to find a solution to this difficult question imposed on us.

However, having no means to confront force with force to defend our young men against forced recruitment into the Armed Forces of an alien country, we leave to each young man to make his own decision on what to do: To remain in Lithuania and continue living one's life based on the laws of the republic of Lithuania or to submit to the demands of the occupational laws.

This was the statement made by the Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium.

Defense Ministry Issues Statement on Deserters

PM3103190890 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[USSR Defense Ministry Press Center article: "What Is Behind the Democrats' Mask?"]

[Text] "Aggression," "punitive action..." These are by no means the "strongest" expressions that can be heard in Lithuania today from the "Sajudis" leaders. What are they discussing with such theatrical passion, what is the subject of the farce played out in a 30-minute program on republican television? Passions are being whipped up in connection with the paratroopers' operation to detain deserters, some of whom had taken refuge in a psychiatric hospital.

The logic of these "benefactors" is strange, to put it mildly. They provoke young people to commit crimes for which they can be held criminally accountable, and they declare those who help to stop unlawful steps—thereby also acting in the interests of the servicemen who left their units without permission—to be aggressors and members of punitive squads.

All the detained deserters have been returned to their units. The Army command intends to act in a similar way in future. The military prosecution service has instituted criminal proceedings in each instance of desertion. Both mitigating and aggravating circumstances stipulated by law will be taken into account.

One cannot but express regret at the position of the republic's law enforcement organs, which, far from adopting measures to stop the desertion, are often helping to shelter people who have violated the law and their military oath.

Numerous instances of pressure being brought to bear on servicemen's parents can be seen in the republic. They are invited to "Sajudis" bases, where they are given specific "recommendations" on persuading their sons to desert. Provocative letters and telegrams, some of them in the parents' names, are sent to the troop units' command.

Naturally, in this complex situation a significant proportion of the population is in the grip of emotion. At the same time there are cases of reason prevailing, when people begin to realize that the separatists are promoting hostility and dissension. Thus in Kaunas the parents of six servicemen who had been weak-willed asked the command to help their sons to return to their place of service. The request was granted. Naturally, in the course of the investigation the fact that they gave themselves up will be regarded as a mitigating circumstance.

The "Sajudis" leaders are not averse to advertising themselves as impassioned champions of humanism and democracy. But the events of recent days leave no room for doubt that this is only a mask.

And it is not only a matter of a fondness for "strong" expressions. Here is just one instance. On the eve of the rally organized by the republic's progressive forces in Vilnius on 27 March, in which servicemen from the garrison also took part, the republican radio and television warned that the participants would be photographed by law enforcement personnel with a view to subsequent proceedings against them as enemies of the Lithuanian state.

This kind of "democracy" permits both outright violence and acts of hooliganism against servicemen. In Panevezhis extremists attempted to draw into a conflict the personnel of a patrol that was on its way back to the military camp after a spell on duty. Only the servicemen's restraint helped to avert a tragedy.

Vilnius Radio Calls KGB Protest 'Interesting'

LD3103095490 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] The USSR Security Committee has protested against the statement by the Lithuanian Supreme Council to Lithuania's citizens recruited in the past by the State Security Committee and cooperating as informers.

The USSR State Security Committee states that the Lithuanian State Security Committee is a component part of the USSR State Security Committee and all its branches will continue to carry out on Lithuania's territory functions provided for by the Constitution, including those against the destructive activity of special services of foreign countries.

It is interesting that the USSR State Security Committee has publicly admitted that it had and has informers and that it is legal according to the USSR Constitution. It also confirms that it does not intend to give up these services.

A strong protest by the USSR State Security Committee against the statement of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania is understandable because it feels that some informers may slip out from its net.

Brazauskas on Worsening Economic Ties

LD3103095390 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Today, during an interview with Vilnius radio, Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, stated that economic ties with USSR enterprises and organizations are getting worse. The supply of raw materials to Lithuania is declining. Industrial enterprises receive only 20% of the required metal. The situation in the supply of timber is especially complex. Such an economic blockade is most vividly expressed as far as Vologda Oblast is concerned. Its party first secretary visited Lithuania together with Mikhail Gorbachev. He is categorically against the supply of production to Lithuania envisaged in the agreements and also against any conclusion of new agreements. [passage omitted] According to instructions from the center the supply of explosives to Lithuania has been prohibited. Without them the work of the Akmene cement factory is virtually impossible because there is no other way to obtain raw materials from the quarries.

Algirdas Brazauskas said a delegation of democratic deputies of the Russian Federation has visited Lithuania. Our government supplied that delegation with information about the worsening relations with enterprises and organizations in individual oblasts of the Russian Federation. According to him, the representatives of the Russian Federation promised to help.

Lithuanian Situation 'Complex, Contradictory'

PM3103151690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Feature comprising TASS, ELTA reports on Lithuania: "Complex and Contradictory Situation"]

[Text] [TASS report—no dateline] The situation in the republic remains complex and contradictory. The inhabitants gave the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet act "On the Restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State" a mixed reception.

Various bodies are now receiving a torrent of letters and requests from citizens of the republic on the subject of a referendum on Lithuania's secession from the USSR, and rallies and meetings are being held. Many citizens do not want Lithuania to secede from the Soviet Union. But the republic's parliament is opposed to a referendum. Its spokesmen say that this would be "illogical and politically bizarre."

The people of Lithuania are also following closely the continuing session of the republic Supreme Soviet. Its work can be judged to some extent from this fact alone: In only 18 days, the Supreme Soviet has adopted and published in the press 79 different laws, resolutions, appeals, and declarations.

Another law—"On the Government"—was published recently. It says, in particular, that from now on there will be 18 ministries in Lithuania. Entirely new ones have emerged. Like, for instance, the Ministry for Protection of the State.

Delivering a report on the political situation at the session, V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, said: "Whatever they may think, it should be made known in advance that any attempts to intimidate the Lithuanian people will not yield the desired results."

Landsbergis claims that the central mass media are deliberately misrepresenting events in the republic, as well as reactions to those events from abroad. "It is clear," V. Landsbergis stated, "that all this is intended for internal consumption, in order to convince citizens of the Soviet Union that the world supports the USSR in resolving this problem."

As for the presence of foreign correspondents in Lithuania, this question has already been examined at the session. "For our part, obviously, we will have to offer journalists the republic's patronage and perhaps start issuing or extending their Lithuanian visas," V. Landsbergis said.

The unauthorized departure of Lithuanian servicemen on compulsory service from military units and their return to Lithuania is assessed by the Supreme Soviet... positively. They believe that the refusal to serve in a "foreign" army is not desertion, and that the soldiers' oath of loyalty to the Soviet Union is not binding on any Lithuanian from 11 March 1990.

There are a great many different rumors and misunderstandings in the republic now on the subject of military personnel taking important state facilities and party buildings under guard. Some people regard this action as the forcible occupation of Lithuania by Moscow, others as a correct decision aimed primarily at protecting socialist and party property and party documents. All this is happening because in the republican mass media this event is interpreted virtually one-sidedly. Not all the inhabitants know, for instance, that by a decision of the Vilnius government many party buildings are handed over to other organizations and even cooperatives, while raykoms [rayon committees] and gorkoms [city committees] of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform have no premises for normal work.

In this complex situation Lithuania's communists on the CPSU platform are doing much work to consolidate forces under the banner of the struggle against extremism and separatism. Their influence is indicated by the fact that 29 raykoms and gorkoms of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform have already been set up in Lithuania.

[ELTA, TASS report] Vilnius, 30 Mar—Central Television the other day carried a report that in Lithuania firearms may be acquired at the kolkhoz market without too much difficulty. Services of the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs investigated the report. No such case was uncovered.

In Lithuania ministries, departments, the enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction, and also citizens are continuing to hand over sporting and hunting weapons for temporary safe keeping. On the instructions of the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, internal affairs departments are accepting weapons even at weekends. On 30 March nearly all the DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] societies and educational establishments handed over their weapons for safekeeping. Some 2,300 items were accepted from individual owners.

Landsbergis Holds News Conference

LD3103150890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Report with recorded excerpts of news conference with Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at the House of the Lithuanian Supreme Council on 31 March; passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] A meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Lithuania took place today. It examined the following problems: The prospects for possible negotiations with the Government of the Soviet Union, the call-up of Lithuanian young people to the Soviet Army, and other questions. The meeting started at 1200. At 1400, during a break in the meeting, a press conference took place. It was conducted by the editor of GIMTASIS KRASTAS [NATIVE LAND], Alfgimantas Cekuolis. Members of the presidium Mecys Laurinkus and Eugenijus Petrovas took part in the conference, and the questions by journalists were answered by the chairman of the Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis.

Some questions are not on the cassette to which we will soon listen. Vytautas Landsbergis was asked what Lithuania would do if the Soviet Union applied an economic blockade to deal with Lithuania.

In the opinion of Vytautas Landsbergis, an economic blockade would be equally unuseful to both sides.

A colleague from TIESA, Vilius Kavaliauskas, asked if esteemed Vytautas Landsbergis had heard something about the claim of the Belorussian government, its territorial claim towards Lithuania.

Vytautas Landsbergis replied that he had heard about such a claim, but he had not received any official information.

There was also a question whether Vytautas Landsbergis was astonished at a strange attitude of the Finnish Government toward the independence of Lithuania. Vytautas Landsbergis answered that Finland is one of those democratic countries which largely depends on the Soviet Union, and therefore it does not have its own foreign policy. Consequently, he is not astonished at the behavior of the Finnish Government.

And now, here are the questions to which you will hear the answers. Journalist Suchodolskis from the Voice of America asked: Nobody in the West has recognized the Lithuanian government. Do you not think, esteemed President, that the West is making a mistake, and that the recognition of the Lithuanian state is hampered by the fact that Lithuania itself does not control its territory?

Here is his reply: "I think that this argument is not sufficient. Those same Western countries used to recognize governments and maintained contacts with them even though civil war was taking place on their territories, and very large territories were controlled by other forces. This is not the case with Lithuania. This argument can serve only as an indication to Moscow of what it has to do if it wishes to hamper the recognition of the Lithuanian government. I do not wish to agree with the assertion that no state has recognized the Lithuanian government. I do not know whether you are familiar with a telegram of the Danish prime minister which I received yesterday. It mentions the Lithuanian government more than once. I think that also a telegram by Vaclav Havel, where he proposes that political dialogue between the Soviet Union and Lithuania should be held on a neutral soil, in Czechoslovakia, is an example of the treatment of two equal partners, two states. A telegram by the Canadian foreign minister speaks only of the conclusions and results of negotiations, about which there is no doubt in the Canadian Government."

Further, Vytautas Landsbergis was asked in English to comment on the decision of the Estonian government. This is his reply:

"I have sent congratulations to the president on the occasion of his election to this very responsible post and the occasion of a very significant decision of the Supreme Council of Estonia, congratulating him, and in his person the whole Estonian nation and society. Estonia has chosen different legal formulas and, it seems, a different way to the establishment of its independence. But, the essence is the same. Legally, Estonia is occupied, and the government rule of the Soviet Union in Estonia has been illegal from the moment of its introduction. This is the same as we have stated. I know that one of the Estonian leaders has made a remark that it is not very useful to say that you are free, when you are in prison. But in prision, too, it is very useful to feel spiritual freedom. But, is it useful to say that you are in prison, when you are in prison? These are only moments of a friendly conversation."

Yet another question in English: Will the Kremlin use Lithuania to intimidate the Estonians and Latvians?

"These questions are addressed to Estonia, Latvia, and the Kremlin. I cannot answer who thinks what. I am convinced that we are and will be together, in spite of the fact that tactics are sometimes different. I would also like to add that different tactics can sometimes be useful. If all three countries use the same methods, Moscow will have answers prepared in advance. At present, Moscow has to think anew what to do with the Estonians. And Moscow is unable to think fast and well." [passage indistinct]

"We do not know what these soldiers will do or why they are there. Maybe, the Soviet Union has too many soldiers and does not know what to do with them. If it is decided to close down the printing works and prohibit the newspapers—Lithuania has already lived for 40 years under the yoke of Soviet Russia when the Lithuanian language, Lithuanian books, and Lithuanian newspapers were forbidden. But, the Lithuanians survived this terrible oppression. I am convinced that the Lithuanians will endure it now as well." [passage indistinct]

It will not be difficult to endure. This was journalist Algimantas Cekuolis during the press conference by Vytautas Landsbergis which took place in the house of the Lithuanian Supreme Council at 1400 hours today. It went on for about 40 minutes and after that the meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Council continued.

Bakatin Comments on Lithuanian Situation

LD0104152290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 31 Mar 90

["Ostankino Studio" program presented by commentator Boris Kondratov, with Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kondratov] It's 1400 Moscow Time. At the microphone is commentator Boris Kondratov. The radio studio in Ostankino is on the line. Your questions today, comrades, are answered by Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs. [passage omitted]

First of all, Vadim Viktorovich, allow me to congratulate you on your appointment to the Presidential Council on behalf of Gosteleradio and the listeners. But let's begin with what you youself want to say.

[Bakatin] Thank you, Boris Fedorovich. First of all, I thank you, of course, for your congratulations. It implies colossal trust and colossal responsibility, as well as a no less colossal amount of extra work, I would say, in addition to the duties of which no one has relieved me or can relieve me. On the contrary, I would consider that I have to carry them out with an even greater sense of responsibility. [passage omitted] As for what I wanted to say, I think I'd probably better say something about what I imagine to be of greatest concern at the moment to Soviet people. That's probably the situation in Lithuania. Or perhaps I'm wrong. What do you think?

[Kondratov] Well, in general, that's right. In general, that's right. Yes.

[Bakatin] I would even say, perhaps, not the situation in Lithuania; perhaps it should have been called the political crisis, which was caused by the unilateral, somewhat hasty decisions of that republic's Supreme Soviet, moreover not even on secession, but on actually breaking off relations with the Union. And one has to be a realist and look objectively at the situation. The crisis has not yet reached its peak and is continuing to be aggravated. Although I would, of course, first of all, probably like to say that we should not dramatize the situation. That serves no purpose whatsoever. Nor should one exaggerate petty instances, petty arguments between some departments or some organizations over some installation or other, or some fact. That, in general, is an unnecessary, pointless and, I would even say, harmful business.

As for the position of the Union government, it remains principled and accords strictly with the decision of the extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies and with the president's decree. It coincides fully with the yesterday's recommendations of Council of the Federation, which, as you know, held its first meeting. It must be said that there is only one way out here. The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, as was noted at the Council of the Federation—its recommendation was as follows—must rescind or at least halt the enactments that it adopted unilaterally, and thereby initiate, or make it possible to start, the proces of talking. Probably no one can agree with such a—I would call it—dictatorial scheme whereby we first adopt a decision and then we are prepared to talk to you. Elementary ethical norms are being violated here, to put it mildly. But the point lies elsewhere. Let's think it through. No normal person can deny the right of any Union republic to self-determination. That is perfectly obvious.

[Kondratov] No doubt about it.

[Bakatin] It is obvious. But I think that it is just as wrong to deny the right of the Union—that is, the other, similar, in fact, Union republics—to demand a preliminary examination of guarantees of the safeguarding of their interests, the interests of those republics, or the interests of the union. And allow me to embark on a contradiction. Possibly not by slamming the door, as it were, by one side or through intimidation by the other, but only in one way can it be resolved—by preliminary—joint, as it were, I think—consideration of all issues on the basis of the legislation in force.

Otherwise, we end up for the time being with a situation in which there is something very odd. Clearly, the new Lithuanian leadership senses some kind of shakiness in its position, and, clearly, owing to the absence of any serious arguments in favor of secession, hastened to head off the possibility of a dialogue and—as we have all noted with amazement—so hastily adopted that unilateral decision.

But I would like to draw attention, since quite a large audience is, I hope, listening to us, to one other circumstance, which is, in my view, far more important than the previous arguments that I mentioned. It is, I think, the most important aspect of the question. We talk about the right of the republic. We talk about the right of the union. The rights of the republic and the rights of the union undoubtedly demand respect. But then there are rights of a higher order—human rights. Now, at least we think that they are rights of a higher order. At least, the Communist Party, when starting perestroyka in 1985, proclaimed the primacy of human rights. We have already said that a human being is not a cog, you understand? Not man for the state, but the state for man, right? But how did the democrats in Lithuania treat this right—if a person goes to bed in the Soviet Union in the evening and wakes up in the morning to learn from the radio that he is already abroad, that he is already in a different state? It's all right if it accorded with his wish. One can only be glad for him then, as it were. But what about those who do not want to lose their USSR citizenship? The suggestion is that there is only one solution: Clear off in all directions, abandoning your home, work and so on. What's the point of that? What about human rights in that case? It turns out that, no, he hasn't any human rights.

[Kondratov] This is all correct, Vadim Viktorovich, but what is the position of the law enforcement bodies? Here I have some TASS material. Thus, the latest Lithuanian Supreme Soviet decision concerning the republic's Internal Affairs Ministry has been published. In it this department is ascribed from now on the function of carrying out laws and decrees—and I quote—only of the Lithuanian Republic. As far as disputes with the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry regarding the material basis of new property are concerned, the republic's Council of Ministers has been charged with resolving this issue with the USSR Government by way of negotiations. And the most important thing is that the present Lithuanian internal affairs minister has stated directly that he will not carry out Soviet laws. Well, if he won't, then who will...

[Bakatin, interrupting] Boris Fedorovich, well, it is, I think, completely...I am very, I am willing to answer this question. But you are a little... [changes thought] It was not the internal affairs minister who adopted the secession decision. This is an unconstitutional, hasty decision, and it is possible to talk about the Lithuanian internal affairs minister and I have not heard such statements on his part at least. But he must now unconditionally carry out the laws and...

[Kondratov, interrupting] All-Union ones?

[Bakatin] All-union ones. And he is acting on the normative basis of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry so long as we are still cooperating to some extent, and we have one aim—in accordance, incidentally, with the decision of the congress—the second point and the third point of their decision of the extraordinary emergency congress. There it was said that we should ensure legality and ensure the maintenance of law and order. This we are doing on a large scale.

But I am talking about something, do you understand? I am talking about human rights. But you, as the saying goes, have led me away to some details. But in the main we must state that a large groups of persons has been simply deprived of all rights, all human rights. Here I would like to say that this is a new arbitrary rule, do you see? Formerly you and I condemned the old arbitrary rule, and we were right to condemn it. Here we are all very enraged by these instances of arbitrariness, as they say, at all stages. But I do not want to, this is not the subject of your and my program. But this is a new arbitrarines on the part of a new power. Do you understand? Even if these people are the minority of the republic. No one is arguing. Incidentally, in fact, no one has even counted. No one has even carried out a referendum here. But this does not change the situation. Whether tyranny by the majority over the minority or by the minority over the majority, it is the same thing.

Nonetheless, I would like to finish this thought...

[Kondratov, interrupting] Yes.

[Bakatin, continuing] ...and would like to say that, anyway, there is one way out. We must proceed by the already tested way of civilized relations. And there is one way out here and it is sufficiently simple: That is to carry out the first point of the congress decision. As I have already said, the second and third points are being basically carried out on a large scale and are being carried out both by the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, if you like. But the hasty secession which contravenes human rights should be suspended, and a law on the order of secession must be adopted, where the main purport, incidentally, should be precisely that any, and every, person has time to choose and has a guarantee of the observance of all his rights and interests, from those of politics to those of property, and there is no other way. I see that you are hurrying me, therefore I...

[Kondratov interrupting] Because the telephones are already red hot.

[Bakatin, continuing] ...am ready to finish this subject—this subject, but I will say that this is the most interesting, and, in a sense, the most acute subject today. Here we must maintain calm and, I say once more, not fall into some kind of panic, not dramatize the situation, but, one must hope that the Lithuanian Government will demonstrate prudence.

TASS on 'Normal Routine' in Lithuania

LD3103130390 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius March 31 TASS—Lithuania is living a normal routine life, as it were. All industrial enterprises, offices and organisations are in operation. The republic has just held the days of Polish culture, and the Vilnius radio parts factory is holding the Russian culture days.

Collective and state farms where soil dries up quicker, began to prepare for sowing. Lithuanians go to theaters, concert-halls and exhibitions.

Children in Klaipeda, together with their peers from Arkhangelsk region, Latvia and Estonia, are staging a contest called "we paint sea". Cities and villages live a quiet life.

However, there is another invisible side of this life: A nagging feeling of anxiety and nervous tension. Lithuanian citizens rack their brians over the following questions: Where is the way out? When will all this end?

Saulius Salpinais, a deputy to the Lithuanian parliament, is convinced that the present ambiguous situation cannot last long. Neither Lithuania nor Moscow are interested in this.

A way out should be found. Salpianis believes that the Soviet Government should be advised "on entering negotiations". The deputy claims that this could be the most correct move for the Soviet Union. The Russian federation and Lithuania which made its choice and will never return to the past.

Valentina Suboc, another deputy to the Lithuanian Parliament and chairman of the Pabradsky rural soviet (council) of Svencenis District, notes that she represents views of Communists who are loyal to the platform of the Soviet Communist Party.

Saying that there were no incidents in the republic and everything was quiet more or less, she expressed, however, anxiety: Voters are concerned over their future.

"Our parliament which is legitimate, I believe, adopts some laws and the Soviet Government—others," Suboc said. "What should ordinary people do? I feel with my heart and mind that each side should meet each other halfway.

"This should be done here, in Lithuania and in relations between Vilnius and Moscow. Lithuania should make the first step. This should be followed by mutual concessions and compromises.

Juozas Kuolialis, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (on the CPSU Platform) is unequivocal in his opinion:

"It would be wiser if the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic—this is how I shall call it—suspend its decisions and subordinated to the decisions of the Third Congress of People's Deputies.

"It is necessary to ensure the operation of the USSR Constitution in Lithuania. We shall win nothing by confrontation. I'm sure that the people do not approve the present actions by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

"They did not suppose that deputies would make reckless, irresponsible, and I should say, adventurist moves. All should act according to the USSR Constitution and future laws which are now being discussed, including the bill on the secession of republics from the USSR."

Kuolialis does not preclude a chance of suspending the operation of the Supreme Soviet. But in his opinion, it would be better if deputies gave a second thought to their moves.

"We believe that the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic should operate in Lithuania," he stressed.

"I represent the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party, which as many former communist parties, is changing its bearings and is looking for ways on the basis of such ideals, as social justice, human freedoms, such priorities, as man, family, state and not on the contrary," said Justic Paleckis, secretary of the Central Committee of the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

"I'd like to say outright: We are looking for points of contact with social democratic parties and for common sources. In this respect, we are ready to cooperate with all progressive forces in the CPSU but, naturally, on a new basis.

"To find a way out of the present situation, the two sides should display minimum ambition, minimum stiffness and maximum goodwill. It is necessary to seek to understand the other side and to renounce the image of enemy which one or the other side sometimes create."

Paleckis believes that there is no alternative to a dialogue and negotiations. The talks will be fruitful if a compromise or a concensus, satisfactory for both sides is found.

The Soviet Union and Lithuania should understand that there are now two sides. They are not identical in their size and force. Nevertheless, the two conracting parties should sit at the negotiating table.

Vilnius Radio Broadcast Operations 'Normal'

LD3103123990 Vilnus Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Contrary to rumors and conjectures, broadcasts by Lithuanian radio are continuing normally, as you can hear. The building is guarded by workers from the militia and internal troops. This was reported in the broadcast "The Republic Today." But, listeners in Canada, Great Britain, and other countries report reception of Vilnius Radio in English has deteriorated. It is almost impossible to understand anything. These broadcasts are sent via transmitters located on the territory of the Soviet Union. The news about the occupation of the House of the Press by airborne troops or any other sections of military units has not been confirmed. [passage omitted]

U.S. Reaction to Lithuania Moves Reviewed

LD2903165190 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Text] Heated debates have been going on in the United States capital over how America should react to the Soviet Union's policy toward the Lithuanian republic. Amidst a variety of opinions voiced (?it has been) fairly clear that preference is being given to a well-balanced and sensible approach to the Baltic situation and that the positive change in American-Soviet relations be preserved and protected.

Significantly, among the hard-line American administrators frowning at Moscow in recent weeks have been those known to disfavor new political thinking. Now that the loudest warnings have been addressed to the Soviet Union by Defense Secretary Richard Cheney, one may wonder whether that hasn't been in consequence to Mr. Cheney's attempts to push a huge Pentagon budget through Congress on the pretext of a Soviet threat which he claims is still there. And in Congress calls for austerity toward the Soviet Union have been coming from Senator Jesse Helms, the very gentleman who used to vigorously protest the INF treaty and other American-Soviet agreements. A few days ago newsmen even received from the senator's office in the capital a list of sanctions against the USSR which might be introduced in the event of a deterioration of the situation in Lithuania. Among the proposed measures are a freeze on cooperation various areas, introduction of tougher COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] restrictions on exports, revision of the air communication agreement and others.

True, most of the other senators have been showing greater constraint. When Mr. Helms' draft resolution on recognizing sovereign Lithuania and establishing diplomatic relations with it was put to a vote it was turned down by 59 votes against 36. Senator Dale Bumpers observed after the voting that a resolution of that kind might only be harmful, and Senator John Chafee said it was up to the president to decide issues of this kind.

Many American Sovietologists agree that the Bush administration must be extremely careful in approaching the Lithuanian question, since the implications are too meaningful. These concern the Soviet policy of perestroyka and the drive in the United States toward better American-Soviet relations and greater democracy worldwide, as well as a package of problems related to arms control. This is a quite understandable approach. One may only wonder whether there will be officials in Washington who will venture on the pretext of defending freedom in Lithuania to endanger the positive achievements in international relations in general and in Soviet-American relations in particular.

Kiev Rally Supporting Lithuania Noted

LD0104112190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Yesterday a rally in support of Lithuania's aspirations for freedom was held in Kiev, thousands of people of the Ukraine expressed their solidarity with Lithuania. A statement concerning withdrawal of the occupational Army from Lithuania was adopted at the rally.

The militia units guarded the participants of the rally in a calm and friendly manner. Here is the text of the placard participants of the raly were holding: Mr. Gorbachev, Lithuania in 1990 will not be turned into Czechoslovakia of 1968.

Polish Minority Views Lithuanian Independence

LD0104201690 Warsaw PAP in English 1920 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, April 1—The stance of the Union of Poles in Lithuania on the issue of Lithuanian borders is clear and firm. In today's Polish TV programme, aired by the Lithuanian television each Sunday, Jan Sienkiewicz, president of the Union of Poles in Lithuania, declared the Union's support for Lithuania's independence. He expressed concern that in this case independence does not mean freedom as there are Soviet tanks on the roads and Soviet helicopters in the sky.

"There can be no changes of the borders. There can be no new borders cutting through the Vilnius region" Sienkiewicz said. In front of TV cameras he appealed to Poles in Lithuania to keep calm and be self-possessed in the present extremely tense situation not to offer a pretext "for bringing troops allegedly in our defence. I believe we shall not give reasons for arms to be used," said the leader of a large and representative organization of Poles in Lithuania.

Readers, Foreign Media Cited on Lithuania

PM0104192890

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its Second Edition on 2 April carries on page 1 a feature under the rubric "Echo of Events" comprising roundups of readers' letters and foreign media comment on developments in Lithuania.

The five readers' letters, each around 150 words long and all carried under the general headline "No to Political Insanity," offer criticism of the Lithuanian authorities' actions and support for President Gorbachev's appeals, and are followed by an editorial commentary which reads:

"The USSR president's appeals to the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet have generated a broad response in the most diverse parts of the country. What is it that worries the readers of our newspaper who have communicated with the editorial office? First and foremost the irresponsible and anticonstitutional nature of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet's actions and the irresponsible and illegal actions of the Lithuanian leadership. Real democracy is inconceivable without compliance with laws. Otherwise anarchy and national breakdown awaits our entire society and any republic.

"There are many tragic pages in our history, but nonetheless the country's unity—economic, political, cultural—is a reality and a guarantee of stability. The destruction of this will lead to unpredictable consequences. For the country, Europe, and the entire world."

The 500-word roundup of world reactions, carried under the general heading "Voice of Reason," cites Belgrade, Paris, Sofia, London, Washington, and New York newspapers on the seriousness of Gorbachev's appeals to the Lithuanians and is prefaced by an unattributed introduction noting that "the main theme of the commentaries is the idea that the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet decisions of 11 March this year and the present Lithuanian leadership's chosen tactics of one-sided actions and ultimatums are causing great concern not only in the USSR, but throughout the world."

The roundup ends with a New York dispatch which reads: " 'Even before the Soviet president made his latest attempt to prevent Lithuania's secession,' THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, 'the Bush administration and Congress officials had expressed concern that the crisis in Lithuania is undermining efforts to bring the U.S. military budget, arms control agreements, and the general tone of Soviet-American relations into line with the new era.'"

Rallies Express Opposing Views on Lithuania

LD0104160890 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—A rally of solidarity with the Russian-speaking population in Lithuania was held near the TV centre in Moscow today. It was organised by the Moscow People's Patriotic Front and the Fund of Social Initiatives.

Rally participants spoke with agitation about the destiny of the Lithuanian people and the Soviet Union as a whole. They pointed to haste with which the present Lithuanian government makes decisions which need a comprehensive and balanced approach.

The keynote of speeches at the rally was to do away with the policy of the Lithuanan government, which actually leads to confrontation and aggravation of difficult social, economic and inter-ethnic problems.

Another rally was held in Moscow. It was co-sponsored by the Democratic Party. Speakers voiced calls diametrically opposed to the ones proclaimed at the rally near the TV centre.

One of the characteristic slogans in support of the policy pursued by the Lithuanian government was "Free Lithuania today, free Ukraine, Moldavia and Russia tomorrow".

Speakers expressed their negative attitude to the election of the Soviet president and the composition of the Presidential Council.

Political Analysts on Solutions to Lithuania

LD3103183590 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 30 Mar 90

["Top Priority" program, presented by Sergey Goryachev, with political analysts Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov]

[Text] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Top Priority". I am Sergey Goryachev. Lithuania remains a top priority issue these days, of course, and a matter of great concern for all of us here, although on Thursday a signal of compromise was reportedly sent to Moscow by the Lithuanian leaders. At a press conference in the republic's capital, Vilnius, Vytautas Landsbergis, the chairman of the parliament said that the problem of referendum could be discussed.

In the meantime the Ministry of Defense of the USSR offered amnesty to those Lithuanian young men who had deserted from the Soviet Army. The ministry said that they would not be punished if they returned to their units and resumed service. Two political analysts, Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov, have come here today to share their views on developments in Lithuania. Hope you've been watching them?

[Plekhanov] From afar.

[Goryachev] But before we get started I would like to remind our listening audience that the Lithuanians' parliament declared the repubic's independence from Moscow on 11 March without holding a referendum among the Lithuanian citizens. This move was denounced by President Gorbachev and therefore, he said, this is not negotiable. Sergey Plekhanov, what do you think about the recent pronouncements of the Lithuanian leaders that they could consider referendum? Do you think that this is a sign of a genuine desire to reach a compromise, to defuse the situation, or is it a matter of tactics?

[Plekhanov] I think it's both. I imagine that some of the leaders of the current Lithuanian government are still hoping that they would be able to get what they've been trying to get and that is independence on the basis of nonrecognition of Soviet sovereignty in Lithuania. At the same time they see that increasingly they are losing their struggle to get the independence this way and that probably (?they) would have to agree to a different method of achieving independence, the method that's being offered by Moscow, and that is the method of negotiation, of gradual process of separation if the republic's population decides that they really would like to get independence. So I think that they are sort of wavering between the two goals, one is what they would like to happen the other is what is most likely to happen because the realities of the situation are such that the decision of 11 March taken by the Lithuanian parliament had no way of achieving the result that they wanted.

[Goryachev] All right Andrey, you agree that what we see now is a shift in the position in Lithuania and, if so, why do you think this is happening?

[Kortunov] Well, I think it is a definite shift and I think that now after some days of hesitation that the Lithuanian government is taking a more realistic approach to its relationship with Moscow. I also think that perhaps the Lithuanian government expected the West to pay more attention to the issue and to support the cause of Lithuanian people more strongly. Now they understand that it would not be realistic to expect something really radical from the side of Western governments, and therefore they have no other way out but to negotiate with Moscow.

[Goryachev] All right. If a referendum is held what will change, how this will change the situation? I do not want to speculate about the outcome of such a referendum, but I am pretty sure that the majority of the people living in Lithuania will vote for independence, after all 80 percent of people living there are of Lithuanian heritage and only non-Lithuanians are reported to oppose independence. So how will this referendum change the situation?

[Plekhanov] Well, you see, it's not just the referendum, it's the procedure for separation from the Soviet Union which is incorporated in the legislation that is now being decided in the Soviet parliament, in the Supreme Soviet. The referendum is just part of that procedure. So agreement to have a referendum is not all; agreement to have a referendum should be followed by the acceptance of the other rules which will now be adopted, and I think it's an important question because we are witnessing the formation of a precedent on this very difficult and complex procedure of a republic wishing to get out of the Soviet Union, to secede from the Soviet Union. And as far as the popular attitudes are concerned, I'm really not sure that everybody of Lithuanian origin is hellbent on running out of the Soviet Union as fast as they can. I think the ties that bind Lithuania to the other republics of the Soviet Union, the ties have existed for 50 years, were not ties of, you know, subservience to domination. The history is much more complex, and while the joining of Lithuania with the Soviet Union really was effected under questionable circumstances and Stalin did it the way which we all now find objectionable, the fact is that in these 50 years Lithuanians, Russians, Bulgarians, Ukrainians, Belorussians...

[Goryachev] Not Bulgarians.

[Plekhanov] Not Bulgarians, well, Bulgarians were also, you know, they were also, they were connected with the Soviet Union one way or another. But I mean there is a lot that can be said in favor of continuing Lithuania's connection with the Soviet Union, even if on the basis of a larger autonomy. So, to sum it up I think that the referendum is not likely in my view to give you an 80 percent vote in favor of immediate independence against 20 percent in favor of something else. I think the picture from a referendum would be much more complex. But if the majority of Lithuanians should decide that they indeed want Lithuania to be an independent country that should start the process of actual separation according to the law which is now being discussed in Moscow's parliament.

[Goryachev] All right, what do you think about that, Andrey?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that one of the reasons to have a referendum is to make sure that the population knows what it has to pay for independence because till now, you know, they have, I think many people in Lithuania have a lot of illusions about independence, about their ability to survive economically on their own basis. And unfortunately I don't think that many people in the current government of Lithuania really understand what it will mean for ordinary people to become independent. I certainly do not exclude the possibility that even taking into account of its, you know losses and sufferings, economic problems, the people would still prefer to be independent, but at least the people should know what they're aiming at.

[Goryachev] I think we should make it clear where the main difference between Moscow and the Lithuanian leaders lies. That is, Mr. Landsbergis actually speaks about regaining independence by Lithuania, because he thinks that joining the Soviet Union back in 1940 was illegal, while President Gorbachev speaks about an act of secession. Do you think they can find common ground on that only by watching closer and examining closer the history of Lithuania's joining the Soviet Union? You are a historian, would you give us some details about that?

[Plekhanov] Well, you know, the Lithuanian government keeps citing the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939, considering it the actual basis for the Soviet Union annexing Lithuania, as they call it. While there is a connection between the Hitler-Stalin pact, the history of Lithuania joining the Soviet Union is far more complex and the Lithuanians at the time were stuck between the two colossuses—Germany, which by that time was rapidly becoming the strongest power on the continent, and the Soviet Union which was resisting Germany, had been resisting Germany, and now signed a nonaggression treaty with Germany. According to Hitler's plan, Lithuania was to cease to exist. I mean while the Germans would recognize Estonia and Latvia as nations which were more or less Aryan, closer to Germans, Lithuanians were supposed to be untermenschen just like the Poles. And according to Hitler's plans they were to become, were to be dissolved in the Third Reich that they were building. So there was a lot of Lithuanians who were very alarmed, very scared of the prospect of being annexed by Hitler. And by the way the Hitler-Stalin pact, 1939, the secret protocol that was signed, actually gave Lithuania to the Germans. It was later that Germany agreed that Lithuania stay within the Soviet sphere of influence. So you see it was very hard (?bold) realpolitik, and the way Hitler and Stalin were deciding on the future of Europe is of course abhorrent, but the fact of life is that the Lithuanians at the time had to choose between, lesser, between the two evils as they saw it, and to many Lithuanians joining the Soviet Union would not be evil, beccause they saw it as a country which, you know, was building socialism and was moving forward and was a much more acceptable place, much better place than Nazi Germany. There were also some Lithuanians who thought that, you know, becoming part of Nazi Germany was a good idea. So it was a very hard choice, but returning to those days and saying oh, let's recreate the conditions of those times and on the basis of that we'll decide on the status quo today, I mean that is very wrongheaded. Fifty years have passed ever since, and those 50 years have been for Lithuania a period of great progress and development. The standard of living, the infrastructure of the country, this is a different story, we should proceed from the status quo.

[Goryachev] From the reality. Yes, after all, after 50 years of living together and no matter how we married, whether our marriage was properly registered, as some of the observers put it here, I think that we've lived together for 50 years and we are bound by so many economic ties. Andrey you're an expert in that, probably you would explain what would it mean for Lithuania to go out, to secede?

[Kortunov] well, it, I think it would depend on the conditions of the secession. If you just imagine that all economic ties between Lithuania and the Soviet Union will be cut, then I think the, new Lithuanian state is facing an economic disaster, because first of all it will suffer from a lack of energy, and it will effect not only industrial capacities of the republic but also you know average people, you know the heating and that stuff. Second, of course, is raw materials. For example, they have, you know a clothing industry and nobody knows how it will work without cotton from Central Asia. The third issue, which is certainly important is the fate of the, well, of the state enterprises that were built with the help of the Soviet Union, with other nations of the Soviet Union, and in fact in many cities of Lithuania most workers are non- Lithuanians, for example in Klaipeda and in some districts of Vilnius. If they're going to go out of the country, of the republic, then it will damage certain branches of Lithuanian industry. Then if you take the export potential of Lithuania, till now it is not very big. The republic cannot even earn the currency it is (?spending) these days, and that can create really very serious problems for the future.

[Goryachev] They say they hope for help from the West. Do you think it is realistic to expect a great help from the West?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think realistically what they can expect is some kind of agreement with the International Monetary Fund and some investment by the multinationals. But everybody recognizes—I mean every serious person recognizes—that the IMF (?things) are not a handout and that Lithuania would have to go through a hell of a (?ringer) economically and socially in order to become part of such an arrangement. So the economic consequences, the economic pain, resulting from disassociation from the Soviet Union would be compounded by the economic pain on a lot of people as a result of forcing, or being forced to become far more competitive and far more productive than they have been. So it will involve really a lot of social pain and I think the Lithuanian people are entitled to knowing the truth about that. Unfortunately, they don't hear it from their leaders, because there is a mentality in the Soviet Union, including Lithuania, of looking at the West through rosy-coloured glasses—I mean as one Soviet poet put it, mimicking this attitude, he said I would like to work like I work herein the Soviet Union, but I would like to get paid like they get paid in the West. So that's the problem.

[Goryachev] Afraid that's impossible.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, right, but the people should be told, they should, people should realize it now before they make their fateful decision.

[Goryachev] We talked about the economy, but I think one of the main concerns is the population of Lithuania. A lot of people would not like to be, to find themselves abroad in regard to the Soviet Union, and I think that some of the people are now calling for the presidential rule. You know that Mikhail Gorbachev now has this right to impose presidential rule and rule directly by decree from Moscow. Do you think this is a real prospect? Will he resort to presidential rule?

[Plekhanov] I don't think so, I don't think so.

[Goryachev] Andrey, you have...

[Kortunov] I hope not. I think that it will be just counterproductive and it will create you know even more explicit nationalist feelings among the Lithuanian population. So I hope that Gorbachev is not provoked to impose something like presidential rule in Lithuania.

[Plekhanov] People who are calling for presidential rule are simply people who cannot imagine a long and difficult process of negotiation to lead to a mutually acceptable compromise. You know, there are some people who are frustrated by negotiation, who are used to administrative kind of relationship: I give orders, you execute them.

[Goryachev] We should rather talk about talks, rather than negotiations (?between) Moscow and Lithuanian leaders.

[Kortunov] What's the difference between talks and negotiations?

[Goryachev] Well, as Mikhail Gorbachev put it, we negotiate with foreign countries, and we have talks and dialogue with our own people. That is the difference, I think.

[Plekhanov] I don't know. I think especially since we're talking in English the difference is entirely lost, because any dictionary would give you talks as a synonym of negotiations, though maybe in Russian there is a slight difference [words indistinct].

[Goryachev] Anyway, let me ask you probably a final question, our time is running out. How would you forsee the developments in Lithuania?

[Plekhanov] Well, it's very hard to see. I don't have any crystal ball, and I don't think anybody has, but I think that common sense is gradually working its way toward a compromise, and I think the statements, the recent statements coming out of Lithuania are encouraging, and I hope that there is a ground for a mutualy acceptable solution. I'm really banking on that, but of course the situation is difficult, and that's not the only possible outcome that one can imnagine.

[Goryachev] Andrey, you have 10 seconds.

[Kortunov] Well if there is no blunder from each side, I think that an end will be in the direction of compromise.

[Goryachev] Thank you. That was "Top Priority," another issue of this Radio Moscow panel discussion, hosted today by Sergey Goryachev. My guests were Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov, our two political experts. Thank you for listening.

Peace Committee Urges Union, Lithuanian Dialogue

LD0104172490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Interview with Genrikh Aviezerovich Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee and political observer of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio, by program presenter Sergey Lomakin, in the television studio on 1 April: from the "Vremya" Program—live]

[Text] [Lomakin] Genrikh Aviezerovich, how are Western countries reacting to the situation that has developed in Lithuania?

[Borovik] Well, naturally events in Lithuania occupy the most prominent place in newspapers and television news programs, especially since yesterday's appeals from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. They are asking what lies ahead: light at the end of the tunnel, or a blind alley? There are quite a lot of hotheads around in the world, including some U.S. senators, political leaders in a number of countries, and the separatists in Lithuania itself, demanding that Western governments immediately recognize the independence of Vilnius and establish diplomatic relations.

But what is interesting is that the West is in no hurry to do this. Landsbergis has even accused the West of again selling little Lithuania to Moscow as they did half a century back. Hotheads are, for instance, demanding abrupt steps from President Bush—for example, the calling-off of our foreign minister's forthcoming visit to the United States. But Bush is not submitting to pressure. On the contrary, he is calling for good sense, for considered decisions, and is saying that he has no intention of complicating the situation in the Soviet Union by his actions. And Bush is not alone in this. The White House announced a few days ago that Margaret Thatcher shares that view of the situation concerning Lithuania. Serious politicians as a whole realize that an ill-considered and illegal secession by the republic from this huge multiethnic country would upset not only the internal ties which have come about within the union but also its relations with the outside world—stability, in other words. Thus the Austrian newspaper NEUE KRONEN ZEITUNG wrote yesterday: The West cannot help Lithuania without creating the threat of wreaking Mikhail Gorbachev's reform policy which is of extraordinary importance for the whole world. Lithuania's demand has come much too soon. The immediate granting of independence could turn into a catastrophe for 700 million Europeans. That is why the West is not at present offering support to Lithuania.

[Lomakin] Excuse me, are you saying that there is a real threat of instability developing for the whole of Europe?

[Borovik] Of course, and this is a very serious thought.

[Lomakin] Even so I would still like to—forgive me, Genrikh Aviezerovich—as they say, the West is the West, but when it comes down to it this is our internal problem.

[Borovik] And our problems are for us to resolve. Yes, I know what you mean. But this problem will not be resolved either through rallies in support or demonstrations against. There is only one way and that is through strict observance of the laws of the Soviet Union—as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev called for yesterday—and good sense and dialogue, within the framework of the Constitution. When we talk of dialogue we generally have in mind dialogue between Vilnius and Moscow, but the fact is that the country consists of 15 republics enjoying equal rights. It is they who make up the Union; it is they who are bound together by all those bonds which constitute its integrity and the sudden breaking of which cannot bring benefit to any of its peoples. And so, maybe we should be thinking of building a dialogue on a different basis, of having all 15 of our republics represented in that dialogue; but not so that 14 of them might accuse one of all the mortal sins, nor so that one might deliver an ultimatum to all the others—not for anything like that. Rather for a calm discussion conducted with humanity and commitment of how to solve the problem in such a way as to take account of the interests of all 15 republics. Incidentally, this need not be conducted at the top level of authority or just among union deputies. I believe that republican deputies, experts, cultural and scientific figures, and representatives of public organizations could all render good services in such a dialogue. And if this idea appeals and if the setting-up of such discussion can be usefully helped by the Soviet Peace Committee or by our republican committees, then I am sure that this Soviet peace movement of ours will be prepared to play a most active part in organising this good cause.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Genrikh Aviezerovich.

Political Dialogue Advocated for Lithuania

AU2903121890 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 28 Mar 90 p 1

[Detlef-Diethard Pries commentary: "Stumbling Block Lithuania"]

[Text] Lithuania is calling for Western help. Gorbachev—as Landsbergis believes—decided to use force. Did he really do so? The United States is "unhappy" about the actions of Soviet troops in Lithuania and warns against "further steps." But will they really "come to help" the Balts?

Moscow, as well as Washington, probably knows the price of the "yes" to the two questions. Far more than the valuable right of self-determination of 3.7 million people is at stake. The point is not the success or the frustration of the attempt that has been made now to transform the USSR into a federation of independent Soviet republics, to which—if this is the firm will of their inhabitants—the right to leave the Union also has to be granted. The positive developments that have been initiated as a consequence of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, in Europe, and in the world are at stake; for example, the hope for a new, better security system for our continent, the dream of peaceful cooperation instead of nerve-racking confrontation, and the prospect of being able to relieve mankind at least of part of its oppressive military burdens. It cannot be ruled out that the events in Lithuania will cast a shadow on the talks of the six nations on the unification of the two German states.

The situation created in and around Lithuania—this has meanwhile become clear—could become the stumbling block on the road to the construction of the frequently mentioned common European home. Only by political dialogue and reasonable action will this danger be avoided. Hopefully, this view will win through in Moscow, Washington, and Vilnius.

Independent Party Chief on 'Complex' Situation

LD3003221890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The situation in the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] remains complex and contradictory. Meetings and rallies are being held. The inhabitants have reacted in different ways to the proclamation by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet restoring an independent Lithuanian state. Our special correspondents report:

[Correspondent Valentin Dvinin, identified by screen caption] The results of elections to local soviets were published in Vilnius today. Roughly 76 percent of the deputies to town, district, and settlement soviets have been elected. However, new voting will have to be held in 844 electoral districts, and new elections will be held in a number of places. The parliament has temporarily suspended its session. The deputies have dispersed to the different districts to meet the voters. But this breather does not mean that political forces are inactive. The parties are working out future tactics and refining their positions.

Today we met the first secretary of the Vilnius City Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania, Algirdas Gricius.

[Begin recording] [Dvinin] What is the attitude of your party to the situation which has developed in the republic?

[Gricius] Well, in the first place our party is 100 percent behind the restoration of Lithuania's statehood. Maybe 70 or 80 percent of us back the current reorganization of the government. But, at the same time, I think that the situation is being complicated by the paratrooper units which have interfered to a certain extent in our internal affairs.

But I think that our position in the current situation is as follows. We consider that certain decisions taken by the Supreme Soviet may have been hasty. First and foremost, this applies to the lads who were serving in the Soviet Army. Maybe we should have found other ways of solving this problem. I consider the situation very complex today. There is no need to further exacerbate it in future. We must find some sort of compromise.

[Dvinin] In what way is your party working for the implementation of its election program.

[Gricius] Well, the first point in our election program concerned the restoration of Lithuania's statehood. As you know, this was carried out on 11 March. Our other goals concern the constitutional rights of citizens and democracy in Lithuania. I think that a lot of work will still have to be done to ensure that independent, self-sufficient Lithuania really does have democratic foundations, because this is not very acceptable without these foundations, without the guaranteeing of constitutional rights. This is something else in our program which we will strive to carry out if we have our own representatives in the government.

At one time, I want to point out that we will restructure the party. The party has not been a party at all up to now, I think. It was a state organization. We want to turn the party into a normal political party in a multiparty system. [end recording]

Landsbergis Television Appeal Noted

LD3003220190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Excerpt] A short while ago, before midnight, Vytautas Landsbergis made an appeal to the Lithuanian people on Lithuanian Television. He assessed the events that took place today at the Lithuanian Procurator's Office and the fact that the Lithuanian Procurator's Office has been seized by the internal troops.

We should not be frightened very much that soldiers are walking in the office of the Lithuanian procurator, the chairman said. We have endured all these years; we will this time as well. What the USSR is doing now will bring only shame in the eyes of all the world, even greater shame than the Soviet soldiers attacking hospitals. What they intend to do now is to destroy jurisdiction itself, to introduce double laws, and this is done by people who call themselves procurators. I think, said V. Landsbergis, that this will end soon because support for Lithuania is growing rather quickly in the world, as is the condemnation of the USSR and its leadership.

Vytautas Landsbergis read the telegram from Vaclav Havel, the president of Czechoslovakia, which voiced concern over the events in Lithuania; an offer was made to hold neutral negotiations with the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia.

Vytautas Landsbergis also announced that today a mass rally was held in Chicago. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Economic Independence Doubtful

WA3003195290 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 21 Mar 90 pp 2-3

[By Valeriy Badov: "Apatites From Morocco, or What the Economic Romanticism of Sajudis Has to Offer Lithuanians"]

[Text] "The Lithuanians left English-style, without saying goodbye." A colleague of mine in the press gallery dropped these words when the president of the USSR was elected. The chairs of the Lithuanian deputies were empty. In the evening, the congress discussed the independence demarche of the Lithuanian parliament. All of us saw the debate, and I have nothing to add.

The congress resolution on the legal incompetence of Lithuania's declaration of state independence by spur-of-the-moment, unconstitutional methods received an overwhelming majority of votes. The notification of the declaration of independence which was sent almost through the mail is something new in the field of international law. After all, it is proper to leave a party English-style, without saying goodbye, but not a union state.

Why is there this haste and hurry if any sober-minded person understands that having the heralds trumpet independence does not yet amount to independence? There is no avoiding detailed talks between the plenipotentiary representatives of Lithuania and the union. The legal procedure of separation is also very complex, all the more so because there is no precedent. They say that Sajudis was in a hurry to face the congress with "an accomplished fact." I think that the opposite was accomplished. This is not how business is transacted in the civilized world.

The sense of the motherland, striving for independence are sacred feelings. Likewise, all peoples enjoy the right to self-determination. This is why the imperial notes in the speech of one deputy were jarring. Supposedly, what kind of geographical news is it? In a state of law, there is no room for arbitrary decisions and ambitions of guardianship, just as there are no senior and junior peoples. In Stalin's time, it was possible to "cancel" the autonomy of an entire people by the stroke of a pen. By now, such excesses in the style of Ugryum-Burcheyev belong among myths. However, why then did the hasty verdict of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania smack of something much too familiar? "Canceling" or "establishing" overnight—all of these are political decisions of the same arbitrary nature. In this instance, I am prepared to agree that half a century of separation from Western democracies has done Lithuania no good. Apparently the habit of making unlawful but "ideologically" orthodox decisions has been assimilated and instilled in the leaders of Sajudis. The new seym without much ceremony transferred "by decree" all enterprises in the territory of Lithuania, including those subordinated to the union, to the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian republic. Further on, it was promised to the people that the issues of **"taking them over"** would be solved through negotiations with the USSR. In simpler words, the joint property of the USSR in Lithuania has been sequestered. Nationalization? "Direct appropriation?" Whatever, but this is not an act which belongs in international law. Article 46 of the Provisional Main Law of Lithuania promises to transfer this state property acquired in a single stroke to the citizens (collectives) for a fee or FREE OF CHARGE. "Take away and divide"—could it be that Mr. V. Landsbergis, the newly elected chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet, confused his scores? After all, we have studied this already. A new "division" has been staked out but this time under the tricolored national banner rather than under the red one.

In this instance, it is hard to suspect that this is a refined legal move or a precedent, perhaps, only a reference to some "sovereign might of the people" which, supposedly, nobody has a right to "infringe upon or usurp." The romantic wording of the new constitution will not replace legal wording since the issue of state separation of Lithuania is on the agenda. Let us leave the legal aspect of secession to the legislators and legal scholars. At this time, we are more interested in the economic aspect of the affair. Will Lithuania be able to feed itself if it secedes from the Soviet Union now?

A Great Leap Into...the Unknown

No, Sajudis was not the one to sow the seeds of economic separatism. It only came as a reaper to the post-stagnation field of politics. The administrative-command system which is now retreating to its own quarters has sown and grown separatism. This system distributed what was acquired in an autocratic manner, plucked prices out of thin air, "attached" customers to the suppliers, handed out subsidies and investments, confiscated profits, and gave presents in petrodollars... In the Baltic area it created "a real mess." The rate of growth in Lithuania was maintained at a higher level than in the union; however, these good deeds of the command system did not make anyone happy. On the contrary, they created a tangle of ecological, interethnic, and political problems.

As I see it, the greatest flaw of the system was in its failure to form even a semblance of the all-union market. Cooperation among the economies of union republics is greater than in the EEC. However, this cooperation is like "spinning a bottle." Customers care nothing for the sellers of the goods, and the latter try to evade contract deliveries. However, all of them put their faith in the center unreservedly—supposedly, it will take care of all.

In such a "work-house," no habit is formed to meet one's obligations and live within one's means. Surprising as it is, we see the same congenital traits of faith...in the benevolence of the center when we familiarize ourselves with the concept of the functioning of the economy of an independent Lithuania. When a new day comes new food arrives! This is the mainstay of the concept if it were to be translated into mundane language. However, there has got to be at least some scenario of economic separation. It appears that there is such a scenario! It can be presented metaphorically as a chess game in the course of which Lithuania tells the partner—that is, the USSR—which moves to make in response. There is also this way to play chess with oneself. Interesting combinations may be designed. However, it is an entirely different game when the partner makes his own moves, and only the ones he considers advantageous for himself.

In Sajudis they refer to the case of Finland. There they have a high standard of living and advantageous trade with the USSR, which delivers to the Finns timber, oil, gas, and other raw materials. However, we trade with them at world-market prices! Meanwhile, our domestic prices are a warped mirror. Due to the nonsensical prices, Lithuania unwittingly receives a benefit. Lithuanian garment industry workers sew expensive lace chemises out of cheap Uzbek cotton. In Mazheykyay they pay 30 rubles per ton of oil from Tyumen. The price for this oil in the world is $140. Natural gas, which a majority of Lithuanian rural homes use for heating, is three times cheaper than what Western Europe buys from the Soviet Union. Cheap raw materials are no small blessing. This is not meant as a rebuke. After all, it is in the mazes of the union Gosplan [State Planning Committee] where the logic of "a community pot" prevails that they set "out-of-this world" prices rather than in Lithuania. Likewise, it is through no fault of the Lithuanians that the imports of various goods to the republic exceed exports by 1.5 billion rubles. It is nothing among us, good friends. However, if the Lithuanian Republic sets up its border checkpoints, switching to the prices of the world market is unavoidable for both partners.

To be sure, the studies of Sajudis contain a hint to the effect that Lithuania could join CEMA as an allied state and trade in transferable rubles. The problem, however, is that CEMA will also be switching to trading in transferable rubles soon. So, what remains, what is the pillar of faith of the ardent proponents of secession? It appears that it is exactly the union assuming the obligation to supply resources to Lithuania at habitually low prices in exchange for traditional counter-deliveries. However, this would mean that 14 union republics would maintain, as Mr. Landsbergis prefers to put it, someone else's state. The consent of all of the republics to this will have be solicited. I believe that it is not difficult to predict their response. To be sure, Sajudis proposes a variant with direct agreements between Lithuania and the union republics. This is commendable, but who would sell at a loss to himself, at prices below those of the world, the cotton and oil which cost money to produce? Besides, it is not easy to see where Lithuania may rustle up hard currency. After all, it will have to fork over an extra $1.3 billion a year for oil alone if it were to be recalculated at world prices.

What is a sober-minded Lithuanian peasant whom Sajudis had promised mountains of gold on the eve of the elections going to gain from such statehood? It is entirely possible that he will have to use wood and peat in his stove instead of natural gas. What about the gas mains of the republic which are 4,200 kilometers long—are they going to be useful? Now that the main pipeline Minsk-Vilnius has been commissioned it is possible to double the deliveries of gas to Lithuania. The Lithuanian GRES [State Regional Power Station] will switch to this ecologically beneficial fuel. Even in the West few countries can afford to convert power stations from coal and heavy fuel oil to expensive methane. Now that we are on the topic of the power industry—according to an estimate by economists close to Sajudis, the republic may cover only three percent of its power consumption from local sources.

All of this may be boring subject matter for those whose spirit soared at the very thought of state independence. "...he has no need for gold when he has a simple product." This reference to Adam Smith was correct in the beginning of last century. However, now it is the end of the 20th century. Latvia [as published] is an urbanized republic with developed industry. It processes up to 13 million tons of oil a year alone. It also consumes a great deal of everything else—machinery, steel, plastic, cars, spare parts... Poor as we are, our cost-oriented economy is ahead of the much more efficient economies of the West in terms of resource-intensiveness. It is difficult to imagine the consequences if the resources stop arriving for as little as a week or a month. This is why, having resolved to sever well-established ties with the circulatory system of the USSR, one cannot proceed from "maybes." Romanticism in the economy threatens to cause privation for millions of people.

The furious "idealists" who started collectivization, confiscations, the exile of the kulaks, and all kinds of other economic insanities also "wished well." All of us, including the Lithuanians, have suffered much due to doctrinaire idealism and going right through to the guiding star. All of the benefits and freedoms promised are smashed to pieces against empty store shelves when politics begins to goad the economy on.

However, there is one more beacon of hope for the determined people in Sajudis—the West!

"...to increase our export potential several or even several dozen times." Here is one more great leap—this time, it is an expansion in the foreign markets. This is a quote from a document of the commission of the Lithuanian parliament for developing the plan of restoring the independence of Lithuania. Elsewhere, it says that it is important "to depoliticize the economy" in order to create an objective basis for evaluating "desires and opportunities." I would venture that the declared leap in Lithuanian exports "by several dozen times" is exactly an example of politicizing economics which we have not encountered for a long time now. This is even more trenchant than the slogan from the time of Khrushchev, "The cow from the state of Iowa, beware!" Any knowledgeable economist will tell you that this is one more romantic illusion.

Alas, the export potential of Lithuania is insignificant. Nobody is objecting to this in earnest. Apparently the slogan was necessary in order to cheer up the fellow citizens. Supposedly if the Soviet Union has no desire to sell raw materials cheaply across the border to Lithuania, there is no reason to worry, we will try our luck in the world market. Supposedly we need to have a model of action in the event of an economic blockade. I am ready to bet that "the blockade" means a logical scenario whereby the republics of the USSR, which are about to switch to self-financing themselves, will in the future charge a foreign Lithuania average world prices in hard currency for their raw materials. Since there is no reduction, this means a blockade!

Well, let us assume that Tyumen "appreciates the situation" and sells oil to the Lithuanians at the old, "Goskomtsen [State Committee for Prices]" price. What is to prevent the Mazheykyay Combine from refining it into gasoline and securing triple profits by exporting it to the West? They say that similar incidents used to occur in the socialist countries given our previous custom of confusing ideology and trade. Therefore, the talk about the future hypothetical blockade of Lithuania rings hollow. It is another matter how Lithuania is going to overcome a sudden shortage of hard currency once it severs the umbilical cord tying it to the country. Academician Stanislav Shatalin, with whom we discussed this problem during the hearings on the Lithuanian demarche at the congress, just shrugged his shoulders in response. I queried him: "Will international banks give loans to Lithuania?" Shatalin believes that they hardly will because there is no collateral for the loans. Perhaps this is the reason for the appeal to boost Lithuanian exports "by dozens of times."

However, how is this cherished goal to be achieved if the self-cost of Lithuanian meat and dairy products is two to three times higher than in the developed countries of the West? The gap in the productivity of labor is about the same. Here is a curious detail: At present, the state buys meat and poultry from Lithuania at 4.7 rubles per kilogram of live weight, whereas the price on the world market is 0.85 foreign-currency rubles. In the EEC, they are racking their brain over how to get rid of the surplus of foodstuffs. Setting out to their markets with one's farm goods is like bringing coals to Newcastle. Meanwhile, rural areas account for one-half of the national income of Lithuania. Older-generation Lithuanians still remember the prolonged economic stagnation of bourgeois Lithuania which had lost an extensive market for sales in Russia.

At present, the republic justly prides itself on producing more meat per capita than anyone else in the country. Articles in local publications voice complaints to the effect that the share of meat used in the republic could be higher. This amounts to a direct prompt to the laymen: We will secede, and there will be more meat. Quite a few people do not know that two-thirds of the meat which the republic contributes to the union stocks are produced on the basis of feed brought from elsewhere.

The illusory nature of economic self-awareness instilled by our "anti-market" dogmatic upbringing is the annoying aspect of such populism. An individual may come out ardently against leveling and in favor of private property, "privatization," competition, and even unemployment. However, this same individual unwittingly believes that everything will work out as soon as they isolate themselves from the union, wind down established economic contacts, and invite foreign capital.

The private capital of Western countries is not a horse from a fairy tale. You cannot order him: Come from wherever you are and show yourself. Those in Sajudis, apparently realizing this, say that the belts may have to be tightened somewhat initially.

To be sure, there are realistic notes. Thus, many people in Sajudis believe that Lithuania's admission to the European Economic Community is far in the future. Truthful notes also creep in when it comes to specifics. For example, they write that if gas produced in the fields of the North Sea were to be substituted for that from Tyumen, Lithuania would not be able to afford this alternative variant. If they do not succeed in agreeing on a price for apatites from the Kola Peninsula, half a million tons of them will have to be brought by sea from...Morocco. However, what would drive one to travel to the far corners of the world, to the countries of North Africa, if there is a proven supplier on the nearby Kola Peninsula which trades in rubles?

These Moroccan apatites, without which the chemical plant in Kedaynyay cannot operate, are particularly impressive. The simple assumption unwittingly comes to mind that the economic romanticism of Sajudis is prepared to turn the entire economy of Lithuania inside out in the name of the obsessive goal of statehood. Is this idea not an end unto itself? Is Lithuania indeed suffering under the yoke if it is the first in the union in the standard of living and, finally, extensive civil liberties are ensured there?

The state is an economic and legal mechanism for the convenience and guardianship of its citizens. The Stalinists have always imagined the opposite: The people serve the state as pagans. We are no longer experiencing the vestigial awe of the machinery of state now that the institution of presidency, a multi-party system, and various forms of property have been introduced. All we want is to respect and obey the law. However, the idea of state self-determination has eclipsed the entire world for the steadfast "adherents of the state" from Sajudis. They are prepared to sacrifice everything on the altar of this idea conceived behind closed doors. You may say what you want, but they are people from the past. By all signs, they want Lithuania to return to the idyll of the pre-war years when the by-no-means poorly educated strata represented Lithuania in the world arena, and the horse-drawn economy plodded along. However, at present the world is approaching the year 2000!

Migrants, stagnants, and occupiers—it turns out that they are making the life of the Lithuanian people miserable. For almost two years now, this propaganda postulate of Sajudis has been drummed into the minds of the people. Discord has been sown among the nationalities residing in Lithuania. Illusions have been preached which may lead to lines at employment services and debt servitude. Can the people in Sajudis not see that all over Europe, in the East and the West alike, a movement is underway for gradually erasing national and bloc frontiers and creating a common European house? This may not happen in the immediate future, but this is where the vector of development points—to a European confederation. However, the narrow-minded proponents of the national idea will not be seduced by any general human priorities. They are prepared to pay any price in order to retrogress.

Landsbergis Absent From Federation Council

LD3003193790 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1825 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 30 (TANJUG)—The Council of the Federation, a new body headed by Mikhail Gorbachev as head of state, opened session in Moscow today in the absence of a Lithuanian representative.

It has been learned that Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of this Baltic republic, explained his non-attendance by the fact that the Lithuanian parliament had declared the republic's independence on March 11.

The session should be attended by the chairman of the supreme soviets (parliaments) of all the 15 Soviet Union republics, as well as by other appointed members of the council, the composition of which has not been made public.

It has also been learned that the session should examine measures for resolving the situation in Lithuania and invest efforts for accelerating the adoption of regulations which should enable any of the union republics to secede from the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, it has been learned that the Tatar Autonomous Republic in the Russian Federation has asked for the status of union republic. A new political party has been formed in the Tatar republic, whose programme boils down to secession from the Soviet Union once the autonomous republic has become a union republic. The Tatar Autonomous Republic borders only on the Russian Federation, of which it is a constituent part.

Baltic Fleet Protests to Landsbergis

LD3003113190 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The situation in Lithuania, which is going through a constitutional crisis, outwardly remains calm. [passage omitted]

The command of the Baltic Fleet has protested to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, on the continuing calls on Lithuanian servicemen to desert from the Armed Forces.

The troops stationed in Lithuania have taken over government facilities under their protection belonging to the whole of the Soviet Union, and also took over the building of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, of the city party committee, and other party establishments [sentence as heard].

First Visa Issued to Foreign Journalist

LD3003134590 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Text] At a news conference today [29 March] by Vytautas Landsbergis questions were asked about the draft law on political parties, the debates on which have started at the Supreme Council. Of course, the journalists were interested in the fate of the CPSU in Lithuania. Vytautas Landsbergis noted that he was not inclined to evaluate a draft law linking it with the CPSU branch in Lithuania. It will be possible to make a comment when the law is passed.

Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy prime minister and leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party, stated that he categorically disagreed that the CPSU group in Lithuania is appropriating the name of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Our programs are essentially different, he said.

Late in the evening the Supreme Council gave a reception for foreign journalists. It seems it went well. Already, during his news conference, Vytautas Landsbergis noted that the republic of Lithuania has already been issuing its visas and can accredit journalists. And this is sacred truth. THE INDEPENDENT correspondent, Edward Lucas, having come by air from Berlin to Vilnius, received the very first visa of the republic of Lithuania and enjoyed the Supreme Council reception.

Suspension of Vilnius English Broadcasts Explained

LD3003125890 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 29 Mar 90

[From the "DX Program"]

[Text] Meanwhile, on 18 March, the Voice of America announced that Radio Vilnius broadcasts to North America had been suspended. As you know, these half-hour programs at 2200 GMT in English and at midnight GMT in Lithuania are aired by five transmitters of the USSR Telecommunications Ministry. Two of them are located in the European part of the USSR and three in the Soviet Far East. From 17 March, Radio Vilnius programs on these transmitters were replaced by a Radio Moscow program in English and Russian.

Attempts to clear up the question by telephone gave no results, so the Lithuanian radio management intervened by sending an official written enquiry to Moscow. A few days later the reply came, saying this was fault during the transmitter switching for the spring frequency schedules and that this fault was corrected on 19 March. Well, maybe it is really so, although one thing remains unclear in this case: on 18 March a colleague radio DX'er (Rymandas Lakis) monitored the frequencies and said that Radio Moscow was already announcing them as theirs for the time when Radio Vilnius should be on the air. Was Radio Moscow notified about this fault in advance?

And that brings us to the end of this DX Program.

Interdepartmental Press Center Opens in Vilnius

LD3003122690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1110 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Vilnius, 30 Mar (TASS)—An interdepartmental Press Center, which includes representatives of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR KGB, the Defense Ministry, and the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform, began work in the Lithuanian capital today. The task of the Press Center is to supply the mass media with objective information about the situation in this Baltic republic.

In the opinion of observers, the sociopolitical situation in Lithuania remains complicated and contradictory. After some administrative buildings in Vilnius were taken under protection, local mass media have been intensively whipping up feelings against the Army and deliberately creating an atmosphere of psychosis and fear of possible terror by the Soviet Army.

Under the sham pretext of organizing opposition to the Soviet troops, the enrollment of volunteers into "regional defense" units is continuing. In many towns units have been created with 100-500 members, including deserters. Cases are being observed of applications by the Russian-speaking population, particularly reserve officers of non-Lithuanian nationality, to be removed from the register in the military commissariats in connection with their intention to leave Lithuania. Thus, in the town of Siauliai over 50 people have already made such a request.

At the same time, statements by Sajudis officials calling on soliders of Lithuanian nationality to refuse to serve in the USSR Armed Forces are not finding support among border troops. Not a single Lithuanian serviceman has left his unit. They all have a negative attitude to the leaflet issued by the Sajudis Press Center which reports that the Lithuanian movement for perestroyka, Sajudis, is carrying out the registration of men aged 19-40 who would like to serve in the "regional defense" system. [passage omitted: young Lithuanian servicemen comdemn the appeal. Lithuanian Supreme Soviet yesterday approved a letter to U.S. Congress. Gennadiy Gerasimov's 27 March statement quoted]

Lithuanian Interior Minister on Domestic Situation

AU3003100890 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 28 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with Marionas Misiunas, Lithuanian interior minister, by NOVOSTI correspondent Igor Dmitriyev; place and date not given: "There Is No Cause for a State of Emergency—Interview With Lithuania's Interior Minister"]

[Text] Marionas Misiunas gave an interview to NOVOSTI correspondent Igor Dmitriyev on the situation in Lithuania. NOVOSTI forwarded the interview to NEPSZAVA.

[Dmitriyev] Are you now completely in control of the situation and see no reason to declare a state of emergency?

[Misiunas] I, personally, do not see any reason for this, but I am afraid that some groups organizing themselves on a prewar basis do not understand the danger in the current situation and might give cause to "put things in order." We have repeatedly asked them to refrain from acting stupidly. We will do everything possible to avoid a nationality conflict. We issue daily summaries in the newspapers and appear on the television daily. I think that Gorbachev gave the order to hand in weapons in order to avoid bloodshed. We hold regular negotiations with the parliament deputies, and we try to halt the spreading of dangerous rumors. I also asked Parliament President Landsbergis to refrain from focusing on minor events, and we also summoned the heads of interior bodies and asked them to avoid any panic-raising. We would be very reluctant to carry out tasks foreign to our mission and take unjustified action. As long as I am the interior minister, I will not allow anyone to compromise the Police.

[Dmitriyev] Voluntary police units are being organized in the Lithuanian Republic. Is there not a danger that the police might get into confrontation with these units?

[Misiunas] These units already exist and their uniforms are also ready. We try to keep an eye on them, and only they will be responsible if conflicts nevertheless emerge.

[Dmitriyev] Rumor has it that, among others, interior ministry units have also arrived in Lithuania from outside. Is this true?

[Misiunas] I am not aware of such units. However, we have information from the population about the arrival of other military units. This information refers to intensive troop movements.

[Dmitriyev] Have you noticed any nationality crimes recently?

[Misiunas] No.

[Dmitriyev] Is your ministry subordinated to the Lithuanian Government or to the Soviet Interior Ministry?

[Misiunas] According to the adopted laws, the Interior Ministry of the Republic is legally under the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian Government. At the same time, we receive part of our financial resources and technical installations from the Soviet Interior Ministry. This duality exists both legally and in practice. I think that, concerning our technical installations, we will change our contacts to a contractual basis in the future. This is all the more necessary because Lithuania does not manufacture cars, pistols, and machine guns. A political decision will probably emerge on this issue; the only question is when. However, I hope that, in this crisis situation, the police will not lose their image, will not have to give up their functions, and will not be deprived of their financial backing.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Reportedly Reorganized

LD3003170390 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The Estonian Supreme Soviet today continued organizing itself. It has elected deputy chairmen and a Presidium, and discussed such issues as the cooperation of the Supreme Soviet and the so-called Congress of Estonia. The Estonian government resigned today, and the election of a new prime minister may be difficult, reports Jarmo Koponen from Tallinn.

[Koponen] The new Presidium of the Estonian Supreme Soviet was clearly elected on the principle of balance. Marju Lauristin, who was today elected second chairwoman, is a counterweight to both the Russian-Estonian (?Viktor Andreyev), who was elected third chairman, and Julio Nugis, who yesterday took on the post of chairman. The liberal Nugis is known to differ in his views from the Social Democrat Lauristin on such things as the economy.

The selection of the Presidium (?took up the) morning. What was most interesting was the selection of Lauristin. As chairwoman, she can no longer propose to speak in the hall. The importance of the Presidium in Estonia is great, however. In addition to sitting on the Presidium, led by President Arnold Ryuytel, they also head committees. The selection of committee chairmen was originally supposed to begin today, according to the schedule. However, after a vote the Supreme Soviet decided to discuss first two other bills and a declaration on Lithuania.

What was first discussed was what sort of cooperation there should be between the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of Estonia. Among the factors in the debate was that, according to several deputies, the Supreme Soviet is the organ of an occupying power, and thus cannot make decisions except in the name of Soviet Estonia. Cooperation is needed, though, because otherwise they will not get to discuss the future status of Estonia in the Soviet Union.

Estonia is due to set up a temporary administrative system. By this means Estonia will attempt to secede from the Soviet Union. This clause is strongly opposed by the Congress of Estonia, because it claims that Estonia never joined, but was forced into, the Soviet Union.

The third matter to be discussed is the support of the Estonian Supreme Soviet for Lithuanian independence. According to the statement, with the help of provocations Moscow has tried to prevent Lithuanian independence. According to the draft statement, Estonia's attitude is that Lithuania's example was a decisive step in the independence movement throughout the Baltic countries. The significance of the support to be given to Lithuania is explained by the Supreme Soviet on the grounds that the situation is still grave and a decision can no longer be delayed.

These bills that came up for discussion are postponing the election of a new prime minister. Nevertheless, Indrek Toome's government resigned in its entirety today. The election of a prime minister is expected to take a long time. The selection is difficult because the influence of the Popular Front in the new Estonian parliament is less than expected. Observers note that this was indicated by the Popular Front's failure to influence the selection of the chairman it wished.

Tallinn Radio Reports on Supreme Soviet Session

LD3003195390

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1700 GMT on 30 March reports on the Estonian Supreme Soviet session. A unidentified reporter says that it was decided that to discuss the following: First, the declaration of the Estonian Supreme Soviet on cooperation in the work between the Estonian Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Congress of citizens; second, the declaration of the Estonian Supreme Soviet on the status of Estonia as a state; and third, the address of the Estonia Supreme Soviet to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Lithuania. "The attitude toward those documents varied; the larger section of deputies strove for them to be adopted quickly. The other group warned against being hasty and wished that documents would be discussed, weighed, and polished thoroughly. There must have been also opinions somewhere in- between," says the reporter.

The first document was debated and adopted, the reporter says he adds that he is not sure that it covers all possible aspects in the relationship of the Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Congress of Citizens.

Then the second document was discussed, the reporter says. He explains that over an hour ago a situation arose in which the Supreme Soviet appeared split. At the most critical moment, he says, Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, interfered and explained his thinking—he had earlier made a proposal that permanent commissions and the presidium should be elected first but his proposal had been voted down. Now he explained that the reason for his proposal was that the commissions and the presidium could have discussed the matter of this document promptly and it would have been possible to give instructions on behalf of the Estonian Supreme Soviet to the Estonian USSR people's deputies in Moscow not to participate in the voting on any secession document on 3 April. Ryutytel thinks that such a document must first be discussed internally in all republics and only then in Moscow, the reporter says. And before 3 April there would still have been time to send the document adopted in Estonia also to other Union republics, according to Ryuytel. Now it seems that it will only be adopted by the Estonian Supreme Soviet on 2 April.

With this explanation, the reporter says, the deputies adopted the declaration, having first decided to rename it as a resolution. A section of the deputies did not take part in the voting. Seventy-three votes were received in favor of the document and three people abstained.

The session is still continuing, the reporter concludes.

Estonian Leaders View Supreme Soviet Session

PM3103201090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Leonid Levitskiy report from Tallinn under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Beginning of Transitional Period Announced"]

[Text] The Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session continued 30 March.

Government Chairman I. Toome announced the resignation of his powers. The deputies, after accepting the government's resignation, instructed him to execute his former duties until the formation of a new government. Heated disputes then broke out. Some deputies proposed that the Supreme Soviet organs be formed first of all—form the standing commissions, elect their chairmen, approve the order of work and standing orders for the session, and only then examine the important documents. But the majority demanded that the discussion of these documents begin immediately.

The next items on the agenda were the discussion of the declaration on cooperation with the Estonian Congress and the declaration on the state status of Estonia, the adoption of a message to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet... All these documents were submitted by a group of deputies from the People's Front in addition to the previously agreed agenda for the session. Why did the session so hurriedly set about examining documents whose adoption could, in the opinion of a number of deputies, have unpredictable consequences? In the break, I interviewed some of the leaders of social movements.

E. Poldroos, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party, People's Front: "Our election platform was based on the promise to restore Estonia's independence and end the occupation. Why did we raise this question immediately at the first session? The situation in Lithuania is very serious. If Lithuania is stifled, we too will be unable to rise up. Frankly, this is our last chance..."

V. Malkovskiy, secretary of the autonomous Estonian Communist Party Central Committee: "I cannot agree, I have no right to agree with documents which talk about changing the state system. My voters' instructions are to seek to strengthen Estonia's sovereignty on the basis of a union treaty with the federation."

M. Lauristin, leader of the Social Democratic Party of Estonia, People's Front: "The declaration on the state status of Estonia merely proclaims formally our intentions. No one has any reason for concern or fear. There will be a transitional period, and we will be able to dispel all misgivings."

A. Gusev, secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party (within the CPSU): "All this haste and mystery was preplanned so as not to allow those deputies who advocate keeping Estonia within the USSR time to prepare. These tactics can hardly be regarded as parliamentary."

The diametrically opposed nature of these remarks reflects the conflicting interests of the two communities in Estonia and the political forces representing them. Neither is opposed to the republic's right to self-determination, its right to secede from the USSR. But they see the paths to independence differently. The People's Front insists that there is only one possible solution—to hold talks with the USSR Government.

The Estonian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), the United Council of Labor Collectives, and Interdvizheniye [International Movement] seek to safeguard the civil rights of the nonindigenous population. The path to independence, in their opinion, lies through a referendum. And participation in it should be open to all the population, without restriction.

...After the break at the session, the declaration on cooperation between the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Congress was adopted by a majority of votes.

The declaration says that the Supreme Soviet recognizes the Congress "as the restorer of the state power of the Estonian Republic." Exactly the same majority (27 deputies representing the Russian-speaking population did not take part in the vote) approved the resolution "On the State Status of Estonia." It notes that "the territory of the Estonian Republic is at present occupied"... The Supreme Soviet deemed the USSR's state power in Estonia to be unlawful from the moment of its establishment, proclaimed the beginning of the process of restoration of the Estonian Republic, and announced a transitional period, which will end with the formation of constitutional organs of state power of the Estonian Republic.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet session continues 2 April...

Estonian Supreme Soviet Moves for Independence

LD3003185690 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Tallinn March 30 TASS—By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan:

The Estonian parliament this afternoon started discussing three draft documents, including a declaration on cooperation with the congress of Estonian citizens, a declaration on the state status of Estonia, and an appeal to the Lithuanian parliament.

The two declarations were suggested by deputies representing the Estonian Popular Front.

Following only a brief discussion, the first declaration was adopted by a majority of votes. Among other things, it declares readiness to cooperate with the congress and the Committee of Estonia in restoring the continuity of statehood in Estonia.

The debate on the second declaration lasted long and was punctuated by numerous breaks. Many deputies said a document of such importance needed a more careful and balanced discussion, including a referendum in the republic.

The majority decided that the document should be called a bill, not a declaration. It was then enacted by a show of hands, with 73 votes for and three abstentions. Nobody voted against the bill, which became effective immediately.

The Estonian parliament denied the legitimacy of the state power of the USSR in Estonia from the moment the Soviet system of government was established here. It also proclaimed the beginning of restoration of the Estonian Republic, announcing a transitional period which will be completed with the formation of the Estonian Republic's constitutional agencies of state power.

Temporary regulations are being worked out for government in the transitional period, ensuring legal guarantees for all inhabitants of Estonia regardless of their nationality.

The session will resume on April 2.

Estonian Council of Ministers Chairman Resigns

LD3003190190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session continued its work. In connection with the expiry of the government's mandate, Toome, the government chairman, submitted his resignation. By a majority of votes the deputies accepted his resignation and also the text of an Estonian Supreme Soviet decision asking Toome to stay on at his post until a new head of government is appointed.

Estonian Draftees Exempted by Labor Service

LD3003211890 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The Tallinn Council announces: Young men due to serve in the Soviet Armed Forces this year but who cannot serve in the Army for valid reasons are asked to present a substantiated application to the labor service commission of the Tallinn Council no later than 16 April. Labor service will exempt a person from obligation to serve in the Soviet Armed Forces. Accepting and registering of applications is done on weekdays from 0900 until 1600, starting 2 April, at Tatari One, on the third floor, at the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic employment center.

Estonia Votes Not To Accept Soviet Annexation

AU0104181390 Paris AFP in English 1639 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Tallinn, April 1 (AFP)—Estonian nationalists Sunday called on Moscow to negotiate on independence for their small republic after parliament here voted not to recognize Estonia's 50- year-old annexation by the Soviet Union. A delegation comprising members of the Soviet Supreme, or local parliament, and a parallel body just set up, the Estonian Congress, should hold talks with federal authorities, said Estonian Heritage Society chairman Trivimi Velliste. Estonian President Arnold Ruutel had already made "contact" with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and there should be more such talks, Mr. Velliste told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE. Mr. Ruutel accompanied several leaders of the Estonian Communist Party to a Kremlin meeting on March 20, he added. His organization is one of three that set up the new Estonian Congress. The local parliament, in its vote Friday, also proclaimed Estonia to be in a "transition period" leading up to independence. "We're in a kind of in-between reign now," Mr. Velliste said, "We can no longer speak of Soviet Socialist Estonia, but we can't call it independent Estonia either."

Even if outside observers see the Estonian parliament's move as evidence of the independence movement's radicalization, several nationalist leaders insisted there was no parallel with neighbouring Lithuania, whose parliament declared independence three weeks ago. Tallinn's move was a "jump forward, but we see no need to declare independence right now" and follow the example of Lithuanians "who chose the hard way."

But for Endel Lippma, a member of parliament, the most important thing was that it had enabled Estonia to change its "constitutional base" by declaring Soviet power there "illegal." Both he and Mr. Velliste refused to put a time limit on the transition period to independence. "We've waited 50 years, we're in no hurry," the deputy said. Asked about Lithuania, Mr. Velliste said he was "cautiously optimistic" but predicted an "impasse," adding that the current crisis "will last a long time."

Earlier in the day Soviet armoured vehicles rumbled through the Lithuanian capital Vilnius in a new show of force by Moscow.

Soviet tanks and helicopters entered the republic last weekend and on Saturday Mr. Gorbachev warned Lithuania to revoke its declaration of independence or face unspecified "serious consequences." However Mr. Velliste said he believed the Soviet leader faced a dilemma. Mr. Gorbachev had to go along with the Soviet parliament's condemnation of the Lithuanian declaration, but he could not opt for military action because of the outcry this would raise in the West. "Gorbachev has to maneuver between (Yegor) Ligachev and (George) Bush," he said, referring to the leader of Kremlin conservatives and the U.S. president.

Meanwhile, as for Estonia, "It's impossible to live in the (Soviet) empire and become a civilized nation," he commented. "There are plenty of signs that this empire...is going to collapse. There's no reason to wait for it passively."

Estonians Vote for Road to Independence

AU3003194590 Paris AFP in English 1832 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Tallin, Estonia, March 30 (AFP)—The newly-elected parliament of the Baltic republic of Estonia voted Friday that the 1940 Soviet annexation failed to put an end to the existence of an independent republic of Estonia. The republic's Supreme Soviet said the "process of restoration of the republic of Estonia is under way". This was the beginning of a "period of transition until the formation of state bodies and the election of a parliament".

The declaration was adopted by 65 deputies. Four voted against and five abstained. Some 30 ethnic Russian deputies did not take part in the vote.

Estonia's members of parliament moved after Lithuanian members of the Supreme Soviet proclaimed independence in March 11 but their approach to secession from the Soviet Union was seen as less radical. The Estonian Communist Party earlier split with the Soviet Communist Party, while allowing for a six-month period of reflection which will enable party representatives to attend the all-Soviet party congress in July.

Pro-Moscow Estonian CP Holds First Plenum

PM2903120390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS correspondent A. Kharchenko report: "Respecting Opponents' Positions"]

[Text] Tallinn, 28 Mar—The first plenum of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party which favors organizational unity with the CPSU was held here today.

It examined questions of relations with the Independent Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. The plenum heard a report from Central Committee representatives on their meetings with communists from Tallinn and Sillanmae labor collectives.

"All complex questions, including property questions, will only be settled at joint sessions of the central committees," V. Yermolayaev, member of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party which has retained its organizational unity with the CPSU and secretary of the "Estrybprom" Association party committee, told a TASS correspondent. "Mutual relations will be based on respect for our opponents' positions."

The plenum considered that the main task of the day is to find out what the republic's communists think of the situation within the Estonian Communist Party, in order to take their oppinions into account in resolving the tasks facing us.

Estonia Transition to Independence Expected

AU3003183390 Paris AFP in English 0956 GMT 30 Mar 90

[By Francis Curta]

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 30 (AFP)—The newly-elected parliament in the Baltic republic of Estonia is shortly expected to declare a transitory period on the road towards independence—a half-way house between nationalist demands for immediate autonomy and Kremlin entreaties not to follow the Lithuanian example. The move was expected after the pro-independence Popular Front movement Thursday managed to force the issue onto the parliamentary agenda, according to parliamentary sources in Tallinn, the capital.

This follows a similar decision by the Estonian Communist Party to split with the Soviet Communist Party, while allowing for a six- month period of reflection which will enable party representatives to attend the all-Soviet party congress in July.

A vote on the republic's status within the Union is not expected before early next week, according to parliamentary sources. Western diplomatic observers here said such the approach reflected the Estonians' more pragmatic tactics in dealing with Moscow, compared to Lithuania which on March 11 unilaterally declared independence from the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

Report on Two Opposing Rallies Held in Riga

PM3003170090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Irina Litvinova: "Rallies in the Latvian Capital"]

[Text] Riga—Two rallies that took place in the republic's capital on 29 March provided two opposite answers to the question: What path will Latvia choose?

It is clear to those who live in the republic that the final destinations became very clearly visible on that day. Some were for "Latvia as part of a renewed federation"; others were for the "Lithuanian path." The first slogan was the leitmotiv of a rally attended by more than 80,000 people and organized on the Daugava embankment by the republic's United Council of Labor Collectives. The second slogan dominated a rally (it attracted around 3,000 people) which the Latvian League of Women applied to hold in the center of Riga. The appeal to go to the rally and "defend Lithuania, condemn Soviet militarism, and call for the deoccupation of the Baltic" was also signed by the Latvian National Independence Movement, the Radical Association of the People's Front, the Latvian Christian Democratic Party, and another dozen organizations that are known for their extremely categorical views and are intolerant of the status quo in Soviet Latvia.

It was all there at the rallies: from songs and flags to appeals and slogans: people went to the embankment carrying red banners and the recently abolished Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] state flag and they sang the "Varshavyanka" and the "Internationale." In central Riga they played the current republican anthem "God Bless Latvia," and the new Latvian and Lithuanian state flags fluttered in the breeze. The rallies were also advertised in different ways. As always, all the media were at the service of the "independents." Deprived of that facility, representatives of the labor collectives' council were forced to hire a small aircraft and drop leaflets on the city.

Sometimes one hears the question: In Latvia's neighbors—Lithuania and Estonia—political passions are on the boil, but doesn't everything seem to have calmed down where you are? Unfortunately, there is no calm, only a lull. April promises to be stormy: An extraordinary congress of the Latvian Communist Party meets on 6 April, on 14 April there is a congress of the independent Communist Party, and at the end of the month there is a citizens' congress. Deputies on a People's Front platform are in a hurry to have a republican Supreme Soviet session in order to, as they say, support Lithuania by making a political decision on the new Latvian statehood. This viewpoint has not yet come out on top and the first session of the republic's Supreme Soviet is set for 3 May.

One of the demonstrators, a Tukumskiy Rayon Soviet deputy, announced that they had refused to carry out the Army draft and form a draft commission. Another speaker pointed out that there will be no independent Latvia without a strong fighting force. There are similar claims on the banners—"An independent Latvia will need its own army, so that no aggressor can invade its territory." Nor were the reminiscences lacking. People called on those present not to forget the legionaries and the forest brothers, "who fought courageously for many years after the war against the penetration of Soviet power into Latvia."

The participants in the rally on the embankment also adopted resolutions. One of them, entitled "Let us defend our rights!", says: "The republic Supreme Soviet and government have adopted and are continuing to draft legislative acts that infringe citizens' constitutional rights—to elect and be elected, to be given work according to professional training, to choose a place of residence even within the republic, and to receive higher education in their mother tongue. Every day on the television screens and in the newspapers and magazines people's honor is insulted and their dignity flouted because they belong to a different nationality, because they have different political views, because they were not born in Latvia. Laws are inactive, prosecutors are silent. And this obliges us to take the enforced measure of creating a committee for the protection of the rights of USSR citizens in Latvia."

Both rallies adopted telegrams to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

Paper Views Latvian Election Activities

90UN1292A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 21 Mar 90 p 2

[By RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent in Riga V. Proskura; "Whose Goose Is Being Cooked?"]

[text] "On 7 October 1988 (the day of the constituent congress of the People's Front of Latvia) we started the revolution of song. We hear hymns in support of the People's Front... in Christian churches. Let 17 March 1990 become the culmination of the revolution of song and flowers in Latvia! Let 18 March become the first day of the parliamentary, intelligentsia and economic revolution."

In the election appeal of the chairman of the People's Front, D. Ivans, to "patriots and sympathizers," (I have quoted just a few sentences above) one can detect not only the professional pathos of a former associate of the Riga journal SHKOLA I SEMYA, which became famous in the republic thanks to its emotional essays on regional indoctrination for the children and for having headed the People's Front of Latvia for 33 years.

In D. Ivans's speech one can clearly sense his own alarm and confusion and that of those who are directing the front behind the well-built back of the young leader, those who had previously proclaimed that they would come to power after the present elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

On 17 March, the day before the elections, functionaries of the People's Front of Latvia gathered on Komsomolsakaya Naberezhnaya—the traditional venue of military parades and holiday demonstrations by the people of Riga—for a demonstration by supporters of the front. Here, to use the terminology of D. Ivans, was abundantly presented the "party autocracy and nomenklatura" of the movement and its ramified organizational and propaganda apparatus. It was not simply an "inspection of the ranks" with the now usual separatist symbols and elements of a street show; it was also a broadcast from the government tribune through direct radio and television coverage of a final coating of ideological dopant. Its essential nature was solidarity with Lithuanian separatists who have "rejected the hand of Moscow," "rejected Gorbachev's ultimatum," and "broken with the Soviet Union." The intent for which there is "no alternative"—to take this step after their own victory in the elections—was confirmed.

However, a relatively new note was sounded: This could supposedly not be achieved without alliance with the "liberal aliens." This theme—international consolidation on an anticommunist basis in order to create an "independent and unitarian Latvian state"—has recently become a leading theme in the speeches of many figures in the People's Front of Latvia. Certain "mistakes" that have been made have also been admitted: The campaign of national chauvinism developed "at the dawn of the revolution of song" has led the movement into a certain impasse. But at the same time the People's Front of Latvia notes the possibility of dialogue with the Latvian SSR International Front of Workers, the Latvian Council of Labor Collectives, and the "Klautsen Company" (Klautsen was the first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party's Riga Gorkom [city committee] and a USSR people's deputy).

The contingent of fellow-seekers of deputy mandates has been limited this time. The average for the republic is less than two candidates per electoral okrug. They have been nominated only if they are sure bets.... At a recent Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum it was noted with bitterness that because of internal party dissensions and splitting acts by the organizers of the "independent communist party," the communists have been unable to offer a unified and complete list of candidates for the republic parliament or put together a common election platform for action. A number of party candidates have "moved" to the People's Front of Latvia platform with their baggage of agitation.

Is this why at the last moment the conductors of the "revolution of song" have been thrown into alarm, and the victory march to government house no longer appears to be a foregone conclusion? Let me offer some "food for thought." At the last election for the mayor of the republic's capital, for example, the People's Front of Latvia had a preponderance of two deputy seats more than the bloc supported by the Latvian Communist Party's Riga Gorkom. But then in the plant rayons (and not only in Riga) less than 70 percent of voters participated. "One worker in three slept in that Sunday," was the taunt from one journalist here. But what if the plant people "sleep in" again this Sunday? So the People's Front of Latvia leaders have started to make a lot of noise about what from their standpoint are "suspicious gatherings" of internationalists who, they say, are oriented on Moscow using the outdated socialist compass and have no desire to move "in the direction of Europe." And the adventurism of the separatists in Latvia has intensified the concern in the workers quarters.

I have carried out my civic duty—I voted. There was one candidate in the okrug—O. Kekhris, a docent at the Latvian University, and he supports People's Front of Latvia policy.

To be candid, some of the points in his program troubled me and I looked around the booth used for the secret ballot. It had been set up obliquely to the table behind which sat the service personnel of the voting station with their lists of voters and bulletins. The light, narrow blinds were only symbolic in separating those who entered from the eyes of the commission. Perhaps it was like this earlier (this was the tenth time I had voted there) but now for the first time I turned my attention to the lack of comfort for the "free expression of my will." Incidentally, the day before I had found a card in my mailbox signed by the "council of workers of Moskovskiy Rayon in Riga" calling on me to boycott the voting for the sole candidate in our district.

The contenders of the People's Front of Latvia advertised loudly in various ways. O.M. Budovskis, a sports psychologist from a neighboring district who, in his own words, has decided to devote himself as a professional to a parliamentary struggle for the motherland's freedom in order the more quickly to "effect the collapse of the empire that has been called the USSR," had written the following: husband of the one-time well-known female basketball player S. Smildzini.... In general, the People's Front of Latvia has had at its disposal the republic's quite powerful printing base Partizdat. Those who voiced their support for this front included the secretary for ideological questions of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, I. Kezbers. And the secretaries of Lithuanian Communist Party areas in Riga—Proletarskiy and Moskovskiy Rayons—reported to the Central Committee plenum that their comrades had access neither to the printing office of the party publishing house nor to most republic mass media facilities.

Now, as these lines are being written it is common knowledge that the elections have taken place everywhere. Already by 1400 hours more than 70 percent of voters had cast their ballots. Of every four persons running, three are representatives of the indigenous nationality (the population of Latvia is divided almost equally into "locals" and "the newly arrived"). About 95 percent of candidates have been nominated for the first time.

...The latest news came late at night. The People's Front of Latvia had not obtained the qualifying majority on which its leaders had been reckoning. But more than half the seats in the Supreme Soviet went to the People's Front of Latvia. However, communists also accounted for more than half of those elected. So who will form the opposition? At a press conference given by D. Ivans and the leader of the front's Duma board, Ya. Shkapars, there was no great rapture. And both those who had themselves arranged for the night meeting and the journalists understood that the political struggle will grow and the polarization of public forces will increase. The more so since there is a noticeable movement in Interfront also. As local observers here are saying, we shall see.

RSFSR

'Democratic Russia' Bloc Formed

LD0104195190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1910 GMT 1 Apr 90

[TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov report]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Apr—"'Democratic Russia' is neither a political party nor an organization. It is an association of people's deputies of the Russian Federation—a bloc—created for joint work at the republican congress, in the Russian Parliament." This is how Mikhail Bocharov, people's deputy of Russia, today defined at a press conference the outcome of the two-day meeting of people's deputies of the republic united in this bloc.

"We see the essence of our activity in struggling for transformations for the good of man," Nikolay Travkin, people's deputy of Russia, noted.

Taking part in the meeting were more than 200 deputies representing various regions of Russia from Murmansk to the Far East. In all, according to figures of the bloc's initiative group, it is supported by some 370 people out of 1,026 possessors of republican mandates. As was noted at the press conference, the bloc should be of a fundamentally open character. "One should not divide in advance all the deputies into conservatives, radicals, and supporters of other positions," Ilya Konstantinov, people's deputy, noted.

At the meeting the bloc's provisional working body was created, and deputies decided not to resort to the procedure of voting for candidatures, giving preference to the method of self-registration. The supporters of "Democratic Russia" formed several working groups which will draft the bloc's proposals to the coming May Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation on a broad circle of questions. These include problems of the standing orders and agenda of the congress, questions of the relationship between the congress and the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, questions of inter-ethnic, and drafting corrections and amendments to the Constitution of the republic. The results of work by the groups will be discussed at the second meeting of "Democratic Russia," which will take place in Moscow on 14 April, when it is planned to discuss and adopt the bloc's platform.

Moscow City Soviet Deputies' Groups Identified

PM3103174690 Moscow TRUD in Russian
31 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by A. Pankov, Moscow City Soviet people's deputy and member of the organizing committee for the first session of the city soviet: "Moscow After the Elections: The First, Organizational Meeting of People's Deputies of the New Moscow City Soviet Has Been Held"]

[Text] "We have heard that in the course of preparations for the first session, the Moscow City Soviet deputies have split into blocs and various groupings, and unity has not been achieved. Concerned about this state of affairs, we appeal to you... Esteemed Moscow City Soviet People's Deputies! What the voters want from you is not a power struggle, not futile debates to clarify attitudes and find out which of you is democratic and which is not, but speedy solutions to the fundamental problems facing Moscow City..." These words are from a message from a group of voters which was read out at the first, unofficial meeting of Moscow City Soviet deputies.

True, there is a shortage of housing, food, good roads... And perhaps many Muscovites expect the substantially renewed body of Moscow City Soviet deputies to adopt speedy measures of some kind, after which everything will immediately change and prosperity will arrive. Alas, so many decisions have been taken over the decades that we should have been living in the "bright future" long ago. I think it is clear to all of us that without a radical updating of sociopolitical attitudes and the economic mechanism, no new Moscow City Soviet resolutions will produce any substantial results.

Virtually all the Moscow City Soviet deputies realize this, but they see different ways out of the crisis. That is why, in the course of the election contest, different social movements were formed, among them the "Democratic Russia" bloc, which both nonparty people and representatives of the most diverse political currents, including CPSU members, joined.

On the Moscow City Soviet, more than 280 of the 464 elected deputies are representatives of this bloc.

In addition, the "Moskva" deputies' group was formed, consisting of 94 CPSU members on the platform of the city party committee. Ten deputies have formed the "Otechestvo" Russian culture society group, and just over 30 are "independents." More than 40 people have yet to decide. All the groups are proportionally represented on the organizing committee charged with preparations for the first session of Moscow City Soviet.

Is this division into blocs dangerous? Will it damage the cause?

"Our country has felt the full pernicious effects of monolithic unity in the past," USSR People's Deputy S. Stankevich, member of the coordinating council of the "Democratic Russia" bloc, stated. "It is the rivalry of different ideas and different groups that guarantees that we will take the voters' feelings more fully into account and formulate the optimum measures. Our bloc's creed is: The city is for people. And we are open to all proposals, whoever they come from."

Another of the bloc's leaders, G. Popov, spoke about "Democratic Russia's" first practical proposals, which it is proposed to discuss at the session. They include a redistribution of power between the soviet and the executive committee, a change in the soviet's structure, the question of Moscow City Soviet's own newspaper, and extremely urgent measures concerning food supplies for Muscovites and the housing problem...

On behalf of the "Moskva" group, Deputy A. Bryachikhin, first secretary of Sevastopolskiy Rayon CPSU Committee, proposed that a detailed agenda be drawn up as quickly as possible, so that there is time to think about it properly.

"Independent" Deputy I. Krugovykh came out in favor of including on the Moscow City Soviet's standing commissions representatives of all deputies' groups, however small. It must be said that this principle is not provoking objections. Representatives of "Democratic Russia" invariably stressed that they do not want to exploit the voting machinery to form the organizing committee. Consideration of minority opinions is an essential condition of a positive process and businesslike cooperation. In their discussions behind the scenes, the deputies also agreed that when it comes to Moscow's practical affairs, membership of a bloc will take second place.

The first session of Moscow City Soviet will begin 16 April. The organizing committee intends to take note of any practical proposals from Muscovites (and non-Muscovites) to improve life in our huge city.

Moscow Solidarity Rally for Lithuania 31 Mar

LD3003090190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0700 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Summary] A meeting of solidarity with the republic of Lithuania is to take place tomorrow in the Gorkiy Park in Moscow. The city authorities have given permission for this meeting to be held. Among the organizations of the meeting are: the Democratic Union, the Memorial, and the Moscow Tribune, in addition to representatives of national movements from the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, and Armenia. The meeting will take place at 1200 Moscow time [0800 GMT]

Gorbachev Approves Revival for Arctic Groups

LD3003202490 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev has approved a program of the social and cultural revival of the ethnic groups in the Soviet Arctic. The program has been discussed by representatives of these small nations at their congress under way in Moscow. The president attended today's session of the congress. After seeing an applied art exhibition featuring works by northern artists, President Gorbachev expressed regret that little had been done in that vast region over the last few years to improve the life of the people and advance traditional handicrafts. The congress has instituted an association of ethnic groups of the Soviet North, Siberia and the Soviet Far East. It has proposed to set up a college to train specialists for national territories.

Gorbachev Attends Northern Peoples Congress

LD3003212190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 30 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The first Congress of the Small Peoples of the North opened in Moscow today. Assembled there are delegates representing peoples living in the northern rayons, from Murmansk Oblast to Chukotka and Kamchatka.

[Correspondent Kusharenko, identified by screen caption] The center of attention of the Congress of Small Peoples of the North are the most acute questions of socioeconomic development, ecology, and the preservation of national culture. Taking part in the work of the congress are Comrades Gorbachev, Maslyukov, Medvedev, Ryzhkov, Vlasov, Lukyanov, Girenko, Manayenkov, Usmanov, and Nishanov. Comrade Vorotnikov delivered a greeting to those assembled on behalf of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

Taksami, chairman of the Organizational Committee of the Congress, who delivered a report, noted that the northern peoples in recent years had encountered serious difficulties connected with the unsystematic mastering of natural resources. The habitat of all the indigenous peoples has been disturbed.

Comrade Khomyakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic State Planning Committee, delivered a report on a comprehensive development program for the economy and culture of the small peoples of the north until 2005. During the interval, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev looked at an exhibition of artifacts by craftsmen of the north and spoke with delegates of the forum of northerners.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] [Words indistinct] a great event.

[Unidentified woman] It is very pleasant for us that you have come here—it is very pleasant...

[Unidentified man] Your presence is very [words indistinct]. [indistinct comments from the crowd]

[Gorbachev] Nevertheless, nevertheless, things are beginning to change, step by step. When I was in Norilsk, I saw it is such a vast object. Such huge profits...billions of rubles of profits. And nearby, no care had been taken of 6,000 people in the region. It is just shameful, shameful.

[Woman] Yes, it really is a shame. [several voices]

[Gorbachev] But I think that what Khomyakov reported just now is a very good program. It ought to be...it ought to be discussed everywhere and supported...adhered to, that is correct...including well, that too.

[Man] It mustn't be adopted now, but later.

[Gorbachev] No, no, it should be looked at...but it is interesting, all the same. [several voices]

[Gorbachev] Did you like...? I liked the report very much. [end recording]

[Announcer] Comrade Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, answered the most burning questions of many congress delegates. [video shows Ryzhkov talking to delegates] Over the two days of the work of the congress, an all-Russian association will be established. Its program and rules will be adopted and its council elected. The congress will continue work tomorrow.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Communist Party Holds Plenum

LD3103184390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] A plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has taken place in Kiev. It was decided there to convene another congress of the Republican Communist Party on 19 June, and to hold report-back and election meetings and conferences within this year. The Central Election Commission for electing delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress was formed. The plenum approved the draft program principles of activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party. It will be published in the press for discussion in party organizations, among the communists, and all the working people of the republic. Resolutions on the Ukraine's political and economic sovereignty and on strengthening the unity of party ranks were also adopted.

Ivashko Addresses Plenum

LD0104215490 Kiev International Service in English 2330 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Excerpts] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine has been held in Kiev. On the agenda were the following questions:

On the program documents to the 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party and the 28th congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine;

On the convocation of the 28th congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine;

On the report and election campaign in the party organizations of the republic;

On the central election commission on the elections of delegates to the party congresses;

An organizational issue.

A report was delivered by the first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, Volodymyr Ivashko:

[Begin Ivashko recording in Ukrainian fading into English report] Comrades, almost three months remain before the 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party, says Volodymyr Ivashko. The present situation is characterized by a diversity of moods, thoughts, and finally, actions, both in the Soviet Communist Party itself, and around it. On the one hand, awareness is growing that in this crucial stage of perestroyka our party remains a guarantor of irreversibility and socialist nature of revolutionary transformations. Necessary for this is a fundamental renewal of the Soviet Communist Party itself. On the other hand attempts are becoming ever more evident to induce the party to reject communist ideals, its vanguard role, and become a parliamentary party or some sort of a discussion club, and in the final end, to entirely disappear from the political scene.

Under such conditions some of the party committees and organizations, many communists, unfortunately, feel uncertainty and lose perspective. In such a situation it is necessary first and foremost to clearly determine one's stand on principle issues, not drift along the political events, but forecast them, and what is more important, actively influence their developments, and in order to do this we today have a reliable basis. The drafts of the platform and the statute of the Soviet Communist Party give landmarks for the solution of the most pressing social, economic and political problems, determine the principle targets for the renewal of our society.

The most essential in these documents is that they firstly unanimously confirm the communist perspective of our development; determine the building of a humane democratic socialism as a practical goal; and secondly, substantiate ways for the cardinal renewal and democratization of our party. Proceeding from this, it is necessary for us, already during the preparation period to the congress, to resolutely become distinct from those who do not share communist ideals and principles; to step up the activity of every party organization, every communist, for overcoming the crisis in the party; consolidate all healthy forces for the solution of pressing problems of social, economic, and cultural development of the republic.

We must be getting ready for the 28th congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, being united ideologically and organizationally, with the program documents being drawn up collectively, the documents which would determine the place and role of the Communist Party in the political life of the republic.

The core of the practical activities of any party is its social and economic policy. The party which is only engaged in discussions is not required by anyone. All the communists should understand that to retreat from economic issues would mean political death of the party. The Politburo, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, not replacing state and economic bodies in managing economy, are obliged to form the social and economic policy and realize it through communists who work at the soviets, economic bodies, through the party committees and grass- roots party organizations. Social and economic policy of the Communist Party of the Ukraine should be aimed at building an effective economy, ensuring high living standards, maximum social and economic protection of the people.

The Politburo considers that the strategic direction to achieve this goal is the republic's transition to economic sovereignty and independence. This means first of all the Ukrainian people's right of ownership of land, natural resources, mineral resources, forests, water basins, other natural wealth, and the main means of production, and also independence in determining the structure of the economy; forms and methods of economic management, and social production; the taxation policy; the distribution of the national product, and incomes; establishment of economic relations at the interrepublican and international levels.

All this should be not just proclaimed but realized in practical terms due to the implementation of a perfect mechanism in the republic, under the new conditions. Our question is: What will the people of the Ukraine have as a result of the introduction of a new economic mechanism? Will it help improve the well-being of every citizen? Necessary, first and foremost, are deep and well-grounded calculations; the elaboration of new principles for economic cooperation with the central bodies and other republics, continued Volodymyr Ivaskhko. But we do not want to join in the political game, in the like-minded contest of who will distance themselves from the central bodies the fastest. In this connection it should be singled out that as true supporters of perestroyka, we cannot imagine its success without the international unity of the USSR nations, without their resolute counteraction against those forces who are using perestroyka for splitting, separatist intentions, and plans.

Presently being worked out are draft laws which will ensure indeed the economic sovereignty of the Ukraine. We hope that the Supreme Soviet and government of the republic will step up this work.

As is known, we quickly move toward market relations with elements of state regulation. Such a transition, if not well thought over, will be accompanied by sharp increase in prices, lowering living standards of the people, unemployment, and so on. This is why the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine considers it among the priorities to ensure such a development of the economy which will allow to raise the well-being of people in practical terms and guarantee a reliable social protection of the people, above all children, young people, families with low incomes, invalids, and pensioners. This requires the elaboration of a corresponding package of laws and decrees, and assiduous work of the new convocation of the Supreme Soviet, the government, all bodies of management.

Among the priority tasks in the social and economic policy of the Communist Party of the Ukraine there should be questions of people's health and ecological issues.

Comrades, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine believes that in separate chapters of the program of the Communist Party of the Ukraine determined should be the basic trends of our policy for the development of socialist democracy and self-governed by the people, continues Volodymyr Ivashko. And the key issue here without doubt is the raising of the role of the soviets at all levels as spokesman of the interests and will of the people, institutes of people's power enjoying full rights, the building of strong [words indistinct] legal, economic, and financial bases for their activity. The new soviets have already in the main been formed. Elections which took place made it possible to notably renew the deputy corps. It is worthwhile mentioning that the Communist Party members make up over 85 percent among the people's deputies of the Ukraine. The Communist Party of the Ukraine will realize its policy through the active participation of the party members and party organizations in law-making activities.

In the near future we are to carry out large-scale and responsible work on preparing the draft of the new constitution of the Ukraine, and other legislative acts. In this we see an important trend in the practical realization of the political sovereignty of the Ukraine, said Volodymyr Ivashko. [end recording] [passage omitted on other speakers]

The full-scale meeting adopted a resolution on the discussed issues. It also adopted resolutions on political and economic sovereignty of the Ukraine, and for strengthening the unity of the party ranks.

The full-scale meeting relieved Vitaliy Sologub from his duties as member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, in compliance with his application.

In connection with being appointed member of the Presidential Council and call of duty beyond the borders of the Ukraine, Grigoriy Revenko has been relieved of his duties as alternate member of the Politburo.

The full-scale meeting elected Grigoriy Kharchenko, first secretary of the Zaporozhye Region Party Committee, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

[Mykola] (Pogrob) first secretary of the Crimean Region Party Committee, was elected alternate member of the Politburo.

Candidate Members Elected

LD0204122990 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0230 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] In connection with Comrade Revenko's appointment to the USSR Presidential Council and his moving beyond the borders of the republic, the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee plenum has relased him from candidate membership of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum elected Kharchenko, first secretary of the Zaporozhye party obkom, as member of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee Politburo. Comrade Bagrov, first secretary of the Crimean party obkom, was elected as candidate member of the Politburo. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian First Secretary Interviewed

LD3103201290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Interview with Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent Lyaskalo; place and date not given—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Lyaskalo] A Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum has taken place. The plenum was an extended one. As well as Central Committee members, there were another 150 invited people in the auditorium. The plenum resolved to convene a congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party in June this year. Two important drafts were approved following a debate, on the guideline principles for the activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party and the draft rules of the Communist party of the Ukraine. What is your forecast for the near future? What political situation are we to have in

Ukraine and what is the role of the Communist Party of Ukraine? What will its actions be?

[Ivashko] Well, forecast is putting it too grandly no doubt. The forecasts made as a rule are not very worthwhile. Things are complicated now and are complicated because not one of us has yet lived in multiparty conditions and we have to realize clearly that this is becoming a reality, albeit merely as a formality—the parties have not been created—but the actual situation of many parties does already exist. In this situation, I see the necessity—and I think this will come into being—for consolidating those forces which adhere to positions of Leninism within the Communist Party of Ukraine and of the independence of the Communist Party of Ukraine within the framework of the CPSU.

[Lyaskalo] Where, for the most part, do you see, to put it briefly, the independence of the communist Party of Ukraine within the framework of the CPSU?

[Ivashko] You know, I don't want to turn to the past but all the same the Communist Party of Ukraine has had the same rights as, say, any oblast party organization somewhere or other and basically there are a great many questions we should have decided ourselves. Cadre issues and those of a party press, matters of tactics, etc. All of this at one time had to be agreed with the center. I don't think we need to do that. A party of three million communists, even if it becomes a little smaller, has sufficient experience and knowledge itself and is in charge of the specific situation in the republic and various regions of the republic which differ sharply from one another in many parameters.

'Difficult' Georgia Trends, Politics Noted

LD0204165990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Video report by correspondent N. Gongadze, identified by caption, in Georgia on 2 March; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] And now our correspondents in Georgia report. Difficult processes of their own are under way in this republic, too. [video shows street scenes; people reading newspapers and talking; a large demonstration outside an official building with Georgian national flags being held aloft]

[Gongadze] Never before has such political activity been observed in Georgia. Every day brings something new. And today, too, there is interest in a report from the 18th plenum of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, at which it was decided by a majority of votes to convene a congress of the communists of the republic on 15 May, halving the number of party representatives and delegates.

It must be acknowledged that now that a most acute power struggle has begun, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has found itself in a fairly complex situation. As early as the beginning of March at an extraordinary session, the republic's Supreme Soviet declared the Union Workers' and Peasant's Treaty between Georgia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic of 21 May 1921, and the Union Treaty on the Formation of a Federation of the Transcaucasian republics of 12 March 1922, unlawful and invalid. The Treaty on the Formation of the USSR has also been deemed unawful with regard to Georgia.

Proceeding from this, the irreconcilable opposition in the shape of the National forum now asserts that the parliament of the republic that is currently functioning is also unlawful, and inasmuch as elections to the Georgian Supreme Soviet have not been held along the lines of introducing a multiparty system, it is proposing its own version of opposition leadership: a national congress elected by universal suffrage and secret voting.

In the current struggle for power, the Social Democrats regard it to be more reasonable to carry out the registration of the Georgian political parties operating within the framework of the Constitution and, starting talks with the official authorities, to create a transitional coalition government involving representatives of the opposition and public associations in the Georgian Council of Ministers [video shows correspondent interviewing G. Dolidze—identified by caption—secretary of the party committee of the 'Elektrovozostraitel, Electric Locomotive Builder, Production Assistant]

[Gongadze] How are the communists acting? Are there any who do not want to be in the party today?

[Dolidze] There is...[changes thoughts] well, over this period, starting on 9 April, I would say, about 60 communists have handed in their party cards. Well, I would say that this trend is still continuing.

[Gongadze] And where do you think the answer lies?

[Dolidze] Without fail, a new party has to be created—this will be a Georgian Communist Party with its own rules, its own program—and all work directed towards this. And this has to be done without delay.

I have always thought that there has to be a multiparty system, but the other parties should also go through an administrative registration process.

Caucasus

Internal Affairs Deputy on Transcaucasus Situation

LD3003162190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1513 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 March (TASS)—Major General Anatoliy Kirilyuk, first deputy chief of the political directorate of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, said today in an interview with a TASS correspondent that reports from Soviet Azerbaijan have became increasingly alarming in recent days. He noted that the situation had become particularly complicated in regions of Azerbaijan bordering the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

In his words, there was intensive cross-fire in Ilyichevskiy and Babekskiy Rayons on 29 March. On the same day a special operation was carried out on the border of Kazakhskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR, and Idzhevanskiy Rayon of Armenia during which 19 fighters of Armenian nationality, including six inhabitants of Yerevan, were detained. The participants in the operation did not use their weapons and no one was injured. A total of 32 Armenian fighters have been detained since 25 March.

General Kirilyuk reported that 300 servicemen of the internal troops were moved to the town of Nakhichevan on 29 March in order to stabilize the situation.

An analysis of events indicates that a fresh socio-political explosion is possible, the general believes. Six headquarters and 44 armed formations, with a total strength of more than 6,000 men have been discovered in Azerbaijan. Leaflets have appeared in Baku justifying the actions of extremists, and the discrediting of republican and union bodies of power and the promotion of Azerbaijan's departure from the USSR are under way.

The situation is also being whipped up in Nagorno-Karabakh, where Armenian fighters have also become more active. In recent days they have carried out attacks on a security post, a bus carrying Azeri passengers, and a guard detail from a military unit. There has been loss of life.

It has been established that in Gorisskiy Rayon in Armenia there are armed formations numbering from 60 to 250 people. On the border with Azerbaijan's Lachinskiy Rayon, entrenchments and dug-outs have been prepared on Armenian territory.

It is quite obvious that the trend toward stabilizing the situation that has taken shape does not suit certain forces in both republics, General Kirilyuk believes. They are striving to drive Armenian-Azerbaijani relations into a blind alley again.

The internal troops are doing everything necessary to stabilize the situation in the region, to avert bloodshed, and to guarantee the security of citizens. Active work is under way to seize weapons from the extremists, Anatoliy Kirilyuk stated.

Azerbaijani, Armenian Leaders Meet in Georgia

*NC0204084190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 31 Mar 90*

[Text] An important step was taken in the capital of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] to normalize the situation in the Transcaucasus and build confidence between the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Gasanov and Markaryan, chairmen of the Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR Councils of Ministers, [words indistinct] during talks that they are prepared to hold a practical dialogue. They believe such a dialogue is essential because the confrontation has assumed such dimensions that it may be impossible to prevent future incidents.

The need to hold talks was noted in the USSR Supreme Soviet's 5 March decision. USSR people's deputies from Azerbaijan and Armenia, responsible workers from soviet and law enforcement organs of the two republics, and leading officials from the Azerbaijan and the Transcaucasus railway networks and the civil aviation organizations of the two republics participated in the meeting. The consultations, which began on 30 March, concluded with the signing of a protocol on the joint measures to be taken by the two governments to restore normal work in the Transcaucasus railway transportation network and the intention of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Justice Ministries to contribute toward strengthening social law and order in the region.

The participants in the meeting said that the situation created in a number of border rayons in the two republics caused them unease and noted their anxiety that further incidents could aggravate the dispute. The work of law enforcement organs alone is not enough to prevent this. Work at all levels must be carefully coordinated, including that carried out by the leaders of the two republics. The two sides are convinced that the strengthening of these relations and the avoidance of confrontation is the only correct way to normalize the situation.

The sides expressed the hope that their calls for common sense and maturity, the draft agreement drawn up during the meeting to normalize the situation in Azerbaijan's Kazakhskiy Rayon and Armenian's Noyemberyanskiy and Idzhevanskiy Rayons, and the draft agreement drawn up by the Azerbaijani and Armenian Councils of Ministers to normalize the situation in rail, automobile, and air transportation will be approved by the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Plans were made to have these documents debated at meetings to be held by local soviets in the border rayons and by the supreme councils and governments of the two republics before they are signed. The realization of these documents is the task of transportation [word indistinct]. They must provide for the restoration of normal life and public law and order.

[Name indistinct], chairman of the [words indistinct]; (?Ginka), first deputy minister of USSR railways; (?Il'chuk), chief of the USSR Main Administration for Aviation Affairs and Transportation Work; Gadzhiyev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; and Dayan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, participated in the meeting.

Discuss Transport Links

*LD3103203290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1442 GMT 31 Mar 90*

[Text] Tbilisi, 31 Mar. (GRUZINFORM-TASS)—Questions concerned with ensuring the normal operation of rail, road, and air transport in the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Armenian SSR have been examined at a meeting between government delegations from the two republics, which was held here at the initiative of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Issues of Transport, Communications, and Information Technology.

The participants in the meeting analyzed the situation in light of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision "concerning the situation in the Azerbaijani SSR and the Armenian SSR, and measures for normalizing the situation in that region." They concentrated their attention on working out ways and means of ensuring that transport operates in an uninterrupted and reliable manner, this being one of the most important conditions for the stable functioning of the national economy.

A plan for joint measures by the Azerbaijani SSR, the Armenian SSR, and the USSR Ministry of Railways to ensure the normal functioning of rail transport in the region was adopted.

Other questions connected with a normalization of the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia were also examined.

More on Meeting

NC0204114990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 1 Apr 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] An ARMENPRES report entitled "Negotiations in Tiblisi" notes that an important step was taken in the Georgian capital to normalize the situation in the Transcaucasus and build confidence between the peoples of Armenia and Azerbaijan. By coming to the negotiating table, Markaryants and Gasanov, chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of Soviet Armenia and Azerbaijan, exhibited a readiness for constructive dialogue. They believe such a dialogue is imperative today when the national confrontation has reached a point beyond which developments could become irreversable.

The need for such a meeting was noted in the USSR Supreme Soviet's 5 March decision on the situation in the Armenian and Azerbaijani Republics and measures to normalize the situation in the region. The meeting was attended by people's deputies from Armenia and Azerbaijan, responsible workers in law enforcement bodies, (?leading officials) from the Transcaucasus and Azerbaijan railway networks and the civil aviation departments of the two republics, rayon party secretaries of border regions, and chairmen of the soviets of people's deputies and the executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies.

The negotiations, which opened on 30 March, ended at well after midnight [words indistinct]. The meeting (?took up the issue) of joint intergovernmental measures to ensure the normal operation of the railway network in the Transcaucasus and (?proposals) by the administrative bodies of Armenia and Azerbaijan on measures to consolidate public order in the region. (?In view of) the disturbing nature of the situation recently prevailing in various border regions of the two republics, the participants in the meeting expressed alarm at the way in which the incidents were developing and the possible spread of the conflict. To prevent this from happening, the actions of not only the workers of law enforcement bodies but also of the workers on all levels, including the leaders of the republics, must be coordinated clearly. The participants believe that the consolidation of such (?coordination) and the avoidance of confrontation is the only correct path for normalizing the situation. They expressed the hope that the call for common sense formulated during the meeting, the draft agreement on the normalization of the situation in Armenia's Noyemberyanskiy and Idzhevanskiy Rayons and Azerbaijan's Kazakhskiy Rayon, the [words indistinct], and the draft agreement between the Councils of Ministers of the two republics on the urgent normalization of air transport would be received with understanding by the public of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

The following participated in the meeting: [name indistinct], chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's [words indistinct] council, chairman of the committee on transportation, communications, and information, and USSR people's deputy; Gin'ko, USSR first deputy minister of railways; Dayan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers; and Gadzhiyev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers.

Armenian Party, Ministry Issues Appeal for Calm

LD0104165690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [V. Nazaryan] Shots and artillery fire were heard again in the last days of March near the village of Yeraskh in Armenia's Araratskiy Rayon, as they were in the other rayons of the republic which border on Azerbaijan, Vaykskiy, Gorisskiy, Idzhevanskiy Noyemberyanskiy, Yekhegnadzorskiy, and Shamshadinskiy Rayons. People have been killed and inured as a result.

[A.I. Pavlyuchenko, head of staff of an Internal Troops division] I'm sorry my voice is rather hoarse, but I have had to talk for 24 hours with the people from Armenia and Azerbaijani villages to persuade them that this bloody war is futile and cruel and that it must be brought to an end.

[Nazaryan] This time too, with the mediation of the Internal Troops it has been possible to remain tense as before. Railway traffic has come to a halt once again. The Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the republic have, taking the situation in the region into account, issued an appeal to the population of the Armenian Soviet Socialist

Republic. It says, inter alia, that ill-considered actions cannot be justified by even the most just demands of our people. The wave of arbitrary violence must be stopped at all costs. We call upon all those who hold dear the future of the Armenian people to show vigilance, endurance, and self-control, and not to rise to provocation. It is calm in the rayons of Armenia which border Azerbaijan today. [video shows mountain range in background; agricultural equipment closer to the camera and in covered sheds; armed soldiers; artillery in close-up; Pavlyuchenko talking to soldiers; railway track seen through wire fencing; more close-ups of troops; soldiers and civilians talking; close-up of text of appeal, in Russian newspaper; more and heavier artillery in close-up; back to the mountain range]

Situation in Shamshadinskiy Rayon Reviewed

NC0204122990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Report by Tsola Grigoryan—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Grigoryan] The situation has recently become extremely tense along Shamshadinskiy Rayon's 160-km-long border. The Azerbaijanis are firing from hideouts close to and some distance from the border. They are using long-range battle weapons and are amazed when the Armenians respond with their hunting rifles. They are not only amazed but also enraged and try to portray themselves as the underdog and appeal to the central authorities for protection from the Armenians. Without conducting an investigation, the center often hastily sends in troops to punish those who are protecting their homes and land. This is sad but true. Yesterday morning a group of raiders entered the rayon from Tauzskiy Rayon, hijacked a passenger bus and a large passenger vehicle, and took the people to an unknown location. What is most galling and strange is that the Interior Ministry troops guarding the road at the border did not attempt to prevent the hijacking of men and vehicles. Unruliness and impunity have a limit; apparently that limit is set by our patience. They have concluded that they can do anything against the Armenians and escape punishment. Expressing the indignation of his colleagues, Eduard Simonyan, a driver at the Nerkin-Karmir-Agbur village near the border, said:

[Simonyan] As regards the developments of the last few days, I would like to say that I do not have good feelings toward our brotherly Russian army. It is enforcing a unilateral disarmament. That is, it is diasarming the people of Shamshadinskiy Rayon and I do not know where this will lead. [passage omitted]

[Grigoryan] Indignation over this discriminatory attitude has created a tense situation in the region. Norayr Mirzoyan, first secretary of the rayon party committee, is also indignant:

[Mirzoyan] Shamshadinskiy Rayon borders the three Azerbaijani rayons of Kazakhskiy, (?Tauzskiy), and Kedabekskiy. Its border runs for almost 160 km. For reasons known to us all, tension between the two peoples has continued for the past two years. The leadership of the rayon as well as all its inhabitants and workers have always tried to normalize relations and keep the peace. Nevertheless, developments continued and culminated in an exchange of fire. What is the reason for this? I blame the union government for allowing terrorism against this peaceful and industrious people who are unable to sleep at night and must keep guard holding their children's hands. Normal work rhythm has been disrupted.

Another problem is that the troops deployed on the Azerbaijani side suddenly enter the rayon, round up people, and spirit them away like wolves without keeping the leadership of the rayon informed. The troops suddenly enter our territory. The leadership of the rayon tries to approach them to learn their intentions and negotiate but they warn us not to come closer than 100 meters or they might shoot. For how long can this continue? Who is going to lead the people? Who will provide some concrete information to help calm the people?

Armenian Attacks on Nakhichevan Resume

NC0104081890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Armenian bandits opened fire on border towns in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] after a lull of 24 hours. Armed extremists attacked Shada town in Shakhbuzskiy Rayon at 0615 today. The bandits' combat operations were stopped after a violent, one-hour clash with the militia forces and the USSR Internal Ministry troops in the town.

A new effort was made to attack [word indistinct] town in Babekskiy Rayon. Thanks to the militia forces' (?effort), the town residents were not harmed.

Mamedov, minister of internal affairs of the Nakhichevan ASSR, said the following to an AZERINFORM correspondent:

The ministry is taking measures in connection with the situation in order to protect people. The most active supporters of the militia organs are the people of the autonomous republic. Regardless of the danger, the people are continuing to be cautious and [word indistinct]. They are not violating the law. This has given us the opportunity to send all the militia forces to protect our borders with Armenia. Regardless of the tense situation, all the establishments and economic organizations are working in the autonomous republic. A number of industrial establishments have put a three-stage work schedule into effect in order to eliminate backwardness. The engineers affiliated with the locomotive depot in Dzhul'fa have said that they will resume work when the railway system situation is stabilized. Meanwhile, particular attention is being focused on supplying foodstuffs and the most necessary provisions to the border towns.

Armenian Attacks on Nakhichevan ASSR Halted

NC3103104290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Nakhichevan—The armed Armenians' attacks on Azerbaijan's rayons bordering Armenia were halted on 29 March by the USSR Army, the USSR Interior Ministry Troops, the local militia workers, the Committee for State Security of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. The sound of arms has stopped. However, the [word indistinct] of the extremist groups continued along the border.

The Nakhichevan ASSR party economic aktivs held a meeting on 30 March to examine the political situation in the autonomous republic and the measures required to stabilize it. Mamedov, who is the Nakhichevan ASSR internal affairs minister, read a report. Dzhelilov, first secretary of the Nakhichevan Oblast Party Committee, called on the people to be cautious and careful.

Armed Armenian Attack Kazakhskiy Rayon

NC3103102890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Kazakh—Bayramov, deputy chief of the Kazakhskiy Rayon Militia Department, told an AZERINFORM correspondent the following:

The situation in the rayon continues to be tense. Bala Kengerli town has been fired on from neighboring Vartashan, which is an Armenian town, for a number of days now. Armed Armenian groups attacked the Barkhudarly, Baganis Ayrum (?Kizilgadzhily), and Cholak towns on the night of 29-30 March. They opened fire on the vehicle belonging to the operations and investigation group affiliated with the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, hitting the vehicle in various places. A number of internal units rushed to the scene and silenced the extremists. Many of the Armenians left their arms and military equipment and fled.

Armed Armenian groups from the Dzhavad settlement fired on (?Kizilgadzhily) town that same night. Military troops seized four rifles, a large quantity of cartridges, seven explosives, and cold steel weapons. No one has been killed or wounded.

Meanwhile, the investigation group, which has been composed of the employees of the USSR Internal Ministry and the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's Internal Affairs Ministry, is continuing its work. An AZERINFORM correspondent has attended the interrogation of three armed Armenians, (?Samuel Khatchaturyan), (?Alovik Asilyan), and (?Lifayi Babayan). (?Babayan) is the father of six children. In addition to arms, a radio was taken from him, which he admitted that he used to contact other armed Armenian groups.

Ekper Veliyev, chief of the Kazakhskiy Rayon Committee for State Security, said that the employees of Azerbaijan's Internal Affairs organs and the fighters of the Soviet Army are (?maintaining) the security of the people. They are protecting our residents against the attacks of the uncontrolled armed Armenians. The armed Armenians are using every means to fulfill their adventurist objectives. Our employees are working among the people of the border towns and urging them not to leave their homes.

Armed Armenians Prepare To Attack Tauzskiy Rayon

NC3103103490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Isay Bagirov, chief of the Tauzskiy Rayon Militia Department, has disclosed that the situation in the rayon is complex. Armed Armenians fired on Alibeyli, (?Arbulan), (?Itreye Bakhan), and Mundzhuglu towns on 29 March. Meanwhile, Major General (?Katalapov), deputy commander of the Northern Caucasus and the Caucasus Administration of the USSR Internal Units, and Mamedov, deputy minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], met with the leading officials of the militia departments and committees for state security in Tauzskiy Rayon and Armenia's (?Bird) Rayon.

(?Medzhnuniyan), chief of the (?Bird) Rayon Militia Department, admitted that 62 armed men arrived in his rayon from Yerevan. He also admitted that the rayon's law enforcement organs have been unable to keep the armed groups out of Yerevan because they carry automatic arms, which the militia workers do not have.

Meanwhile, it has been reported that the armed Armenian groups are preparing for new attacks. However, the residents of Tauzskiy Rayon are not being carried away by rumors. They are not leaving their homes. The situation in the rayon is being controlled.

Soviet Troops Arrest Armenian Recruits

AU3003121490 Paris AFP in English 1145 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 30 (AFP)—Soviet troops have arrested 31 "volunteers" who joined a self-defense groups in the Armenian Republic, a spokesman for the Armenian National Movement said Friday.

The arrests were made overnight along the border with the neighboring republic of Azerbaijan, Alexander Arzumanian told AFP by telephone from the Armenian capital Yerevan.

Clashes between Armenians and Azeris resumed in the region a week ago and have resulted in the deaths of at least 12 people, according to official figures. Inter-ethnic violence in January left around 100 dead.

Mr. Arzumanian said "14 of the 19 volunteers from Armenian self- defense groups arrested by the Army at Chamchadin (northeast Armenia) were taken to the Kazakh region, in Azerbaijan".

"Twelve other volunteers were arrested and taken to Army headquarters in Idzhevan, eastern Armenia," he said.

Moscow recently ordered the abolition of a self-defense force being set up in Lithuania after the Baltic republic declared independence.

Since the resumption of fighting in the Caucasus, special interior ministry troops have been stationed between Armenian and Azeri fighters on the border with Nakhichevan, a tiny autonomous republic and Azeri enclave inside Armenia. The region is near Turkey and Iran.

General Yuri Shatalin, head of interior ministry troops, went to the region at the beginning of the week with orders to end the troubles and Azeri authorities decided Wednesday to close their borders with Armenia.

In other developments, General Anatoli Kapliyev has been appointed military commander in the Azeri capital Baku, becoming the third such official to be named since a state of emergency was imposed two months ago, the Moscow News publication INTERFAX said.

It said the general told local residents that interior ministry troops, aided by police and soldiers, would be in charge of "the struggle against extremist activities at the frontier with Armenia."

About 1,400 interior ministry troops are stationed in Nakhichevan and other border areas where "reinforcements have been sent, notably 300 additional men dispatched yesterday to Nakhichevan," he said.

Shooting Reported 'Along Entire Length' of Border

PM3003212190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 1

[Correspondent A. Mursaliyev report under general heading "Transcaucasus, 30 March": "Baku"]

[Excerpts] In Kazakhskiy Rayon 14 villages are located directly on the border with Armenia. They are all in a state of tension. In some of them only men remain—the women and children have been moved further back from the "front line." The presence of internal troops has not removed the tension. The villages continue to be strafed and raided. [passage omitted]

Shots are being fired and blood is being shed in Tauzskiy, Lachinskiy, Kedabekskiy, Kelbadzharskiy, Kubatlinskiy, and Zangelanskiy Rayons and the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—that is, along the entire length of the border. The attackers are using automatic firearms and artillery.

Azerbaijan Representative on Border Situation

LD3003120290 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 30 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—The railway blast early in the week near Megri in Armenia and the subsequent crisis that swept Transcaucasia were "provoked by those who are against the normalisation of the situation in Azerbaijan, where Armenian and Russian refugees are beginning to return," Azerbaijan's representative to Moscow Zaur Rustam-Zade told reporters here today.

He declined to specify how many refugees had returned to Azerbaijan, however.

Citing Azerbaijani law enforcement bodies, the representative said that "Soviet interior troops detained 19 Armenian militants armed with modern combat weapons in the Kazakh region last Thursday."

Soviet Interior Ministry officials told TASS that 17 armed people were detained on the border between the Azerbaijani Tauzsky region and Shamshadinsky region in Armenia on Thursday. Four people were detained near Barkhudarly village in Kazakh region in Azerbaijan a day earlier, they said.

In both cases troops found grenades, several small-calibre rifles and shotguns on the militants.

A group of Soviet people's deputies from Azerbaijan sent a letter to President Mikhail Gorbachev, demanding measures to step up security on the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia and in Nakhichevan and the imposition of a state of emergency in areas bordering Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijani Communist Party and public organisations have also appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman and Soviet prosecutor general to take measures to prevent an escalation of violence in the region, Rustam-Zade said.

Azerbaijan First Secretary Interviewed

LD3103193690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Interview with Ayaz Niyazovich Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent M. Mamedov; place and date not given, from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Mamedov] While discussing the tasks of the party organization in normalizing the socio-political situation in Azerbaijan, plenum participants noted that, within the process of perestroyka begun in the republic, actions have sometimes been replaced by declarative slogans; the illusion of dynamic growth has been created, while the economy has, to an increasing extent, lost its social thrust. The former leadership of the Central Committee shied away from taking decisions on many painful issues. This, in turn, undermined the confidence of the people in the authority of the party and the powers that be. Little was done to protect the honor and dignity of the Azerbaijani people. The plenum mapped out specific steps to normalize the situation in the republic and called on all healthy forces to rally round to eliminate the backwardness in the republic's socio-economic development and improve the moral climate. The plenum participants adopted an appeal to the country's president, Comrade Gorbachev, which calls on him to take urgent steps to defend the territorial integrity of the republic and the security of its populace. The timetable for the report back and election campaign was determined, as was the date of the convocation of the 32d congress of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan—it is scheduled for 8 June 1990.

Ayaz Niyazovich, what, in your opinion, are the main tasks facing the republic's party organization at the present moment?

[Mutalibov] The main task is to restore the party's lost reputation. We can only restore this reputation by means of specific work within the framework of the program which we debated today at the Central Committee plenum, and which we will bring to the next congress of the republic's Communist Party as its fundamental platform. It should be said that the situation in the republic remains very tense. Unfortunately, this tension is a result of the constant inter-ethnic conflicts which have been going on for almost two years now and which have flared up again in the past few days in the run-up to our plenum. We regard this action as direct aggression on the part of certain Armenian forces. Of course, it angers our public, but at the same time we realize that we must step up our work with the populace and with the people, and provide that which will bring people together in future. Because it is quite simply impossible to go on living and working like this, and we accept full responsibility.

Azerbaijan Central Committee Plenum Convenes

LD3103155690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] There was a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan today. It discussed the tasks of the party organizations to normalize the sociopolitical situation in the republic. A report was delivered by Mutalibov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan.

The tone of the speeches made during the debate was to a large extent determined by the situation in the region, which has been considered exacerbated in recent days as a result of the terrorist acts in populated points in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and in other regions of the republic bordering on Armenia. There have been human victims and great material damage has been caused.

This latest flare-up of aggressive actions by extremists, which have the character of a well-organized provocation in the opinion of the participants in the plenum, has the aim of preventing normalization of the situation in the region. The speakers called on communists and all the working people of the republic to maintain restraint, vigilance, and sober reason.

Analyzing the reasons which led to the political crisis in the republic, the participants in the plenum stressed that during the process of perestroyka which has begun, the course of improving the economy and renewing sociopolitical and spiritual life has not been carried out consistently. Concrete deeds have at times been replaced by declarative slogans. Party organizations and law enforcement bodies displayed helplessness, were unable to comprehend in time the changes in public moods, were unable to do anything to counteract the upsurge in meetings, and took up a wait-and-see stance.

Taking advantage of this, the anti-perestroyka forces destabilized the situation and created an atmosphere of chaos, anarchy, and lawlessness. It was all of this which led to the tragic events in Baku in January 1990.

Life in the republic is returning to normal even though with great difficulties. Now, one of the chief tasks is to resolve the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. In the opinion of the participants in the plenum, the efforts of the republican organizational committee, party, local soviet, and economic bodies should now be directed toward this. It is only in this way that favorable prerequisites can be created to resolve other urgent tasks as well. Expressing specific proposals of ways to get out of the crisis situation, the participants in the plenum stressed the need to consolidate the healthy forces of society, to direct communists and all the working people of Azerbaijan to implement the concepts of national rebirth, and the resolution of such social problems as the rehabilitation of refugees, improvement of the ecological situation, and improvement of the state of affairs in housing construction, and public health.

Stress was laid on the importance of deep transformations in the republican party organization, too, the elaboration of program documents which define the position of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan within the framework of the CPSU, ensuring it greater independence which has particular importance in the conditions of renewal of the Soviet Federation.

A report from the commission set up by the January plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Republic of Azerbaijan to study the circumstances of the introduction of the state of emergency in Baku was put forward for discussion by the plenum's participants. Questions of convening a routine congress of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan, holding report-backs and elections in the republic's party organizations, norms of representation and procedures for electing delegates to the 28th CPSU congress and to the congress of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan were discussed.

In a message to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and to the members of the Presidential Council, the plenum came out in favor of immediate and full ensuring of the constitutional rights of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic.

Reshuffles Central Committee

NC0104114990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Today the newspapers published a detailed report for readers about the plenum held by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee yesterday. The plenum examined the party organization tasks in regard to normalizing the republic's social and political situation. Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, read a report which was then debated. The plenum adopted a decision on the subject under examination.

The plenum heard a report by the committee established by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee plenum in January to study implementing the state of emergency regime in Baku. Afrand Dashdamirov, the committee chairman, briefed the plenum. It was decided that the committee should continue its work.

The plenum also discussed convening the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress, holding accounting and election meetings in the republic's party organizations, norms of representation, and the election of representatives to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress. Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, briefed the plenum. A decision was adopted to convene the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress on 8 June 1990.

The plenum participants approved an appeal to President Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU general secretary, calling for immediate protection of the constitutional rights of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and warding off the Armenian SSR's aggressive attempts against Azerbaijani territory.

The plenum also examined organizations questions. Gasan Gasanov was relieved of his responsibilities as secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee because he was appointed chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. Karulovskiy was relieved of his responsibilities as a member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau because he was appointed to work in the CPSU apparatus. Muslim Mamedov was relieved of his responsibilities as a member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau because he was appointed to another post. (?Ragib) Guseynov and Ratib Aliyev were relieved of their responsibilities as chiefs of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee departments because they were appointed to other jobs. [Name indistinct] Aliyev was removed from his post as the chief of one of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee departments because he retired. (?Timurlengk) Nabiyev was relieved of his responsibilities as the chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Party Affairs Department because he was appointed to another post. Fuat Musayev, chief of the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for the Control of Industrial Security and Mining, was elected by secret ballot as the secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and member of the Central Committee Bureau.

According to the changes in the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee apparatus, Afrand Dashdamirov was relieved of his responsibilities as chairman of the State Legal Affairs Committee. He was elected by secret ballot as the secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, chairman of the State Legal Affairs and National Relations Department, and member of the Central Committee Bureau. Refet Agayev, first secretary of the Baku City Party Committee, was elected by secret ballot as a member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Central Committee Bureau. The plenum elected (?Sabukhi) Abidinov as chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Party Work and Cadre Affairs Department, [name indistinct] Muradaliyev as chief of the Central Committee Ideology Department, Aydin Gadzhiyev as chief of the Central Committee General Affairs Department, Arif Emirzade as chief of the Central Committee Agrarian Department, and Oktay Shakhbazov as chief of the Central Committee Administration of Affairs Department.

[Name indistinct], Afanasev, and others, who are the responsible functionaries of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the plenum's work.

Kapliyev Named New Military Commandant in Baku

LD3003110490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0945 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku, 30 Mar (TASS)—A new commandant of the city, the third since the introduciton of a state of emergency in Baku, has taken up his official duties here. Major General Anatoliy Kapliyev has been appointed to this post. He is a regular member of the military who has served in the internal troops for more than 30 years.

The new commandant in Baku was born and grew up in Dagestan, an autonomous republic in the northern Caucasus, and he is well familiar with the history and traditions of the Caucasian peoples. In his first address to the population he noted that tendencies for the situation to improve in the city have taken shape. At the same time the situation in the frontier areas on the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia has become drastically more complicated. Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, is in Transcaucasia to organize the struggle against extremists, defend the legal rights, and ensure the safety of the inhabitants in the frontier areas. An operation to stop the activities of vigilantes is being conducted by the joint efforts of the internal troops, the bodies of internal affairs, and the Soviet Army.

The commandant also reported that in the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], in the areas of Azerbaijan that border on Armenia, there are approximately 1,400 servicemen of the internal troops. Additional forces and equipment are being redeployed there. On Thursday another 300 servicemen were sent to Nakhichevan.

In the village of Germechakh (Nakhichevan ASSR) Veli Zeynalov, 33-year-old head of the State and Law Department of the Nakhichevan Party Oblast Committee, was killed by vigilantes who had arrived there to organize protection together with the bodies of law and order for the rural population from attacks by bandits.

Kapliyev on Protective Measures

NC0104071990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 1 Apr 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Today the newspapers published the following notice issued by Major General Anatoliy Kapliyev, the new Baku Commandant:

A reliable protective system has been created to obstruct the armed Armenian extremists' attacks on residential areas in Azerbaijan's border regions. Special military measures and search operations are being put into effect in areas where the Armenian bandits gather. The question of deploying internal troops in the territory of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (?within a period of two days) has been resolved. In the border rayons, 35 armed Armenian bandits have been captured along with their arms and combat equipment as a result of the measures taken since 24 March. All have been handed over to the inquiry group of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry.

You can read a more detailed report in today's newspapers.

Strike in Nagorno-Karabakh Declared Over

LD0204134390 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Text] Stepanakert, Nagorno-Karabakh, April 2 TASS—Employees at factories, state intitutions and in public transport in Stepanakert, the administrative centre of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region, have resumed work after two months of strikes.

A spokesman for the military commandant's office of the state of emergency area said the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh "is relatively calm under the control of USSR Interior Ministry troops."

Central Asia

Kazakh Supreme Soviet To Convene 24 April

LD3103154190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Decree of the Presidium of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on convening of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The Presidium of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet decrees the convening of the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic of the 12th convocation on 24 April 1990, in the city of Alma-Ata.

Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

Kazakh SSR Appoints New KGB Chairman

LD3103211290 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 2300 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Text] The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium decree appoints Comrade Nikolay Anatoliyevich (Vdovin) as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Committee for State Security.

The Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium released Comrade Miroshnik from his duties as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Committee for State Security, in connection with his transfer to another post.

Kazakh Communist Party Plenum Held 19 Mar

LD2003111190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent O. Baymbetov on the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee plenum held in Alma-Ata on 19 March—live or recorded]

[Text] [D. Baymbetov, identified by caption] Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic from the Republic's Communist Party were elected at the plenum—17 out of 26 candidates were favored with deputy mandates. Among them are only two party workers. The situation in the republican council of primary party organizations was also discussed. [video shows scenes at the plenum]

"Real Sovereignty for the Republic in a New Federation and the Renewal of the Communist Party of Kazakstan"—that is the title of the draft platform of the Central Committee of the Kazakh Communist Party for the 17th party congress in the republic and the 28th CPSU Congress, as confirmed at the plenum. The very name of this document indicates its contents.

Prospects for the development of Kazakhstan are seen not only within the composition of a united national economic complex in the country, but on the basis of a clear demarcation of the competence of the union and of the republic in planning, in the finance and credit sphere, and in price formation. Communists spoke out resolutely in favor of Kazakhstan's right to ownership of its land, of the land's underground natural wealth, of its water, of its forests, and of its other natural resources. [video shows correspondent speaking to Nazarbayev, Kazakh Communist Party first secretary]

Tell me, are there any kind of peculiarities, and if so, what are they caused by?

[Nazarbayev] What kinds of peculiarities would I particularly like to stress?

They include the question of developing sovereignty in the practical sense in Kazakhstan; economic independence; and political independence. It is necessary to start preparing immediately the draft of a new union treaty, where the powers of the center and those of the republics will be clearly defined. In the political sense we think that, basing ourselves upon the CPSU statutes, the Kazakh Communist Party should have independence in working out its own platform; in working out its own program; in deciding structural, cadre, and other questions; and in establishing ties with communist parties of other union republics and perhaps with corresponding parties in foreign countries.

Uzbekistan Parliament Elects New Leaders

LD3103145190 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Tashkent, Uzbekistan, March 31 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Pruger:

The first democratically-elected parliament of Soviet Uzbekistan closed its session here today. The session continued for a week instead of the usual one or two days.

The parliament elected Uzbek communist leader Islam Karimov the republic's first president. Shukurulla Mirsaidov was elected prime minister, and Mirzaolim Ibragimov was named to head the parliament.

The session also elected memebrs of the republican supreme court and regional courts.

On Saturday, the session adopted a resolution on the Uzbek government's report and programme for economic and social development for the next five years (1991-1995).

Deputies discussed the Supreme Soviet's proposals for amending the USSR Law on Military Service. The proposed amendments provide for reduced terms of military service and give young people called up to serve in non-combatant construction units the possibility of working in places where they live.

Legislators pointed to the importance of this proposal, saying almost 30 per cent of all Uzbek draftees are not fit for combatant service for health reasons.